

WHO
ARE THE
AMERICANS?

By

GEORGE ALLAN KENNEDY

917.3 K35w

\$1.25

Kennedy

Who are the
Americans?

Acc. No.

1123407

203

MAY 31 '33

RT4-7010

JUL 2 '33

917.3 K35w

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library

Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0158283 1

BRAD
OT

MO

MAY 31 '44

X 203

JUL 28

47

NOV 15 '44

JAN 31 '45

MAY 31 '45

X 203

JUL 6 '45

MAR 27 '48

X 379

DEC 30 '48

WHO
ARE THE
AMERICANS?

**WHOM
ARE THE
AMERICANS?**

By

GEORGE. ALLAN KENNEDY

THE PAEBAR COMPANY

PUBLISHERS

1943

Copyright, 1943

by

THE PAEBAR COMPANY

NO PART OF THIS BOOK MAY BE REPRINTED IN ANY FORM WHATEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHERS, UNLESS BY A REVIEWER WHO MAY PRINT BRIEF PASSAGES FOR PUBLICATION IN A NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE.

All Rights Reserved.

PUBLISHED BY THE PAEBAR COMPANY
NEWBURGH, N. Y.
NEW YORK OFFICE, 220 WEST 42nd STREET

Dedicated to
YOUNG AMERICA
With Greetings from
the Author

CONTENTS

<i>CHAPTER I</i>	
THE MAYFLOWER	1
<i>CHAPTER II</i>	
COLONIZATION AND SETTLEMENT....	10
<i>CHAPTER III</i>	
HYPHENATED AMERICANS	20
<i>CHAPTER IV</i>	
BRITISH SUPREMACY	30
<i>CHAPTER V</i>	
THE FIGHT FOR A CONTINENT.....	39
<i>CHAPTER VI</i>	
EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION	49
<i>CHAPTER VII</i>	
RACIAL HATRED	59
<i>CHAPTER VIII</i>	
BARRIERS TO UNITY.....	69
<i>CHAPTER IX</i>	
BONDS OF UNITY.....	76
<i>CHAPTER X</i>	
CONFORMITY TO TYPE.....	84
<i>CHAPTER XI</i>	
DEMOCRACY A PLANT OF SLOW GROWTH.....	93
<i>CHAPTER XII</i>	
THE CHURCH AND DEMOCRACY.....	102
<i>CHAPTER XIII</i>	
MENTAL SCRAP	111
<i>CHAPTER XIV</i>	
CIVILIZATION AND "ISMS".....	120

<i>CHAPTER XV</i>	
"BLOOD IS THICKER THAN WATER"....	130
<i>CHAPTER XVI</i>	
"AS A MAN THINKETH SO HE IS".....	139
<i>CHAPTER XVII</i>	
SECULAR EDUCATION	
AND THE CHURCH.....	150
<i>CHAPTER XVIII</i>	
NATURALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP..	161
<i>CHAPTER XIX</i>	
THE FUTURE AMERICAN.....	169

CHAPTER I

THE MAYFLOWER

ABOUT three-and-a-quarter centuries ago the *Mayflower*, an early seventeenth-century sailing vessel, crossed the Atlantic on a voyage which was only a little less adventurous than that of Columbus, some one hundred and twenty-eight years earlier.

This vessel had a passenger list of men and women who called themselves "Pilgrims" and was, without doubt, the most remarkable group of people that ever sailed from any shore.

The group was remarkable in the sense that each of them was well aware that it was a throw of the dice as to whether the adventure would end in life or death.

The enterprise called for something more than soldier-courage in the heart and soul of each member of the group. It called for faith in themselves and faith that the providence of God would come to their aid if disaster threatened.

Those stout-hearted Britishers — for they

were from England — were in need of all of this faith, for such a faith could have been easily shaken had they been reminded of the fate of the first attempt by a British colony farther down the coast, under the leadership of the English nobleman and adventurer, Sir Walter Raleigh.

When we speak of America and of those who had gambled everything — even their lives—in an adventure which had proved disastrous to others who had dared to risk it, we must never overlook the character of the men and women who made that first permanent settlement on this continent a possibility.

Those of us who are kin in racial blood to them and whose descendents later on blazed the first trails across a continental wilderness, like to stand with chins up and refer to them as our forefathers. To get a broader perspective of the background of a racial group which the rest of the world now refers to as “the Americans,” it is very essential not only to keep in mind the successful voyage of the *Mayflower*, but the character of those on board, and whom we might distinguish as the genesis of that which was later to become a great nation.

Other racial groups came over on their

sailing vessels from the continent of Europe, but none of those groups developed enough political sentiment while colonization was going on to make any political ideas on the future of the colonies a thing to be reckoned with by the more dominant British group.

In the earlier settlement of America, or that part of it along the Atlantic seaboard stretching from Maine to Florida, the colonization was largely under the guidance and inspiration of the British element. The significance of this, noted by the historians of that period and the powerful influence it exercised over the political events which followed later on, without doubt—at least in my own mind—saved America from an inheritance of European racial wars which has divided the people of that continent for a thousand generations.

In answer to our question, we are now concerned with the history, population or tribal life of a race of people who may have inhabited this continent for untold centuries before the arrival of the white man. The red-skinned race is referred to by some people as the "real American." But as the remnants of a passing race—for that is really its present position in our population—we may put it

aside as a question which will be of little or no historic interest to the coming American.

This coming American, with the passing of the centuries, will be recognized as a racial group that will encompass the entire western hemisphere. At least this is how they are apt to be recognized by the rest of the world after the entire population of the hemisphere is native born. But despite this influence of native birth which made them Americans, large numbers — perhaps for generations — will continue to cling to the nomenclature of Old World ancestry.

Certain racial groups like the Irish and the Jew, owing to a past cultural training, traditions and beliefs which are largely an inheritance handed down to them, have become instinctive in character. No doubt this tendency towards race consciousness and exclusiveness which has never been a popular brand of culture with the common people can be traced very largely to inherited religious beliefs which extend far back into the history of a racial group and may be as basic in its psychology as the emotion of anger. This is especially true of the Jewish race. We have a score or more of these racial groups who left their homeland for reasons best known

to themselves and who are now the constituent parts of a political fabric which some of us like to believe is the greatest nation on earth.

Rome was not built in a day. Neither was the Republic of the United States of America. That kind of an enterprise must have its start in the dream of the slave and the prayers of millions for the inalienable rights of free men.

This idea was put into the original blueprint by the Creator of all life and it has never been repealed. If the reader of history has noted the facts related as carefully as he should, he will agree that the little group of Britishers who made a landing at Plymouth Rock must have been keenly alive to the essential, political and social commitments which would give the largest possible freedom and liberty to the individual. They and their ancestors whom they left behind in England had had their reasons for this. The long fight between the King and Parliament over the question of supremacy in government (which was finally ended by a civil war and the execution of the King in the tower of London) was something which could not be forgotten by a people willing to die for its liberty and face any hardship to obtain it.

Before landing, we are told that everyone

whose name was on the passenger list of the *Mayflower* was asked to sign a pledge of unity to stick together; that they got down on their knees to ask God to help them keep that pledge. Under the circumstances, the pledge was a very human one and called for unconditional loyalty if the enterprise ahead of them was to succeed. If it failed, as the first attempt at British colonization did twelve years earlier farther down the coast, the fate of this colony would be the same—that is, famine, starvation and death. If not that, massacre by hostile Indians who looked on the white man, at the time, as an undesirable invader.

Any young American within reach of a school and a daily newspaper and who is fortunate enough to have a mind sufficiently developed to note the relation between the trend of current events and those with a background in the distant past, will see the importance of the pledge taken by the little group of Britishers who seemed to have had a mystical glimpse into the future and the building of a great nation.

It must be remembered that during the century-and-a-half of colonial settlement when other racial groups from the continent of Europe made some progress with settlements

of their own, the British group, with the dominating influence of British institutions, managed to maintain its leadership.

With this influence it was as natural as growth itself that the political structure of the coming Nation already in blueprint would have to rest on principles of self government which would give the individual citizen one hundred per cent of his Bill of Rights. This idea was never the concept of a political dictator and has never been found in the blueprint of human rights where those rights were respected. This was keenly sensed by those Britishers whose ancestors had passed through the school of experience and who believed it was something beyond the power of any human government to take away. The long fight between the King and the parliamentary system of government of our British ancestors was a textbook study for the American statesmen who wrote the Declaration of Independence. A study of this political experience in government went back even to the signing of the Magna Charta in the 13th century.

If the foregoing viewpoint would seem to be placing too much emphasis on the British influence at the time when we were clearing the ground for the foundation of a political

structure, it would be pertinent to such a viewpoint to ask, who were the rivals of the British for this dominating influence at the time, and why were they as national units finally left out of the picture in the settlement of the North American Continent?

A title to territory by right of discovery has never been a very permanent one. The Catholic missionaries of both France and Spain played a leading role in supplying this kind of a title to a large part of the territory they explored on the continent.

In the colonization disputes which followed later on it became necessary for England to settle the question with France on the battlefield. This practically put an end to territorial titles by right of discovery. The territory held by France west of the Mississippi was sold direct to the young Republic after the latter had acquired its independence from the mother country.

What little Spain had left north of the Rio Grande was bought and paid for in the same manner and at the same bargain counter.

Both Spain and France had their explorations on the continent and some of the adjacent islands before the landing of the *Mayflower* from England; but if we leave out the prov-

ince of Quebec in Canada, their colonization, so far as its influence went on the cultural life of the rest of the country's population, remains to this day practically unnoticeable.

CHAPTER II

COLONIZATION AND SETTLEMENT

IN a nation that is made up of many racial groups, I am perfectly aware that I invite criticism from one or more of these groups when I stress the importance of British colonial settlement on this continent, and how this settlement later on showed the trend of thought in America for a political structure which would chart the way towards a self-governing democracy.

We are inclined to believe that had it not been for the pioneer spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race which dominated this early settlement of the continent, the American democracy, as we know it today, would have been something quite different.

When this dominant pioneer of our race set sail for America he had something more in the way of luggage than the few things he had put into his sea-chest. He realized that he was a free man—that he was headed for a part of the world where there were no crowned rulers, where there was no social

caste and where a man would be free to plan his own life and do some thinking for himself.

It was possible at the time for any other racial group from the continent of Europe to have followed up its rights of colonization and discovery, with its own particular brand of cultural tastes which could have made it a rival of the British for leadership. Both France and Spain had this opportunity, but both were outrivaled and outwitted by the British in leadership.

France had not prepared herself for the revolution in government which England had gone through before the adventure in America. Some allowance must be made for France for this unpreparedness. Moreover, when the revolution did overtake her, it came with the fury of a hurricane and laid in ruins a political structure which had nothing better at the time to set up in its place.

Prior to the Revolution, the great mass of the common people were uninformed as to what was in the minds of those who were responsible for the overthrow of the government and perhaps the latter were in the same predicament as the corporal was, when he asked the question, "Where do we go from here?"

It would be a rare thing indeed in an uprising of this character, if a Washington would come to the front as a leader for the British colonies as he did in America. Washington and his followers knew what they wanted and, what is more, they knew how to get it.

Evidently the French political leaders at that time did not. After the execution of the king and queen, the mob revolutionists could produce nothing better in the way of leadership than the bloodthirsty triumver—Stanton, Marat and Robespierre.

As the Revolution moved forward in its sea of blood, the ax of the guillotine, taking each one of them in turn after a brief disastrous leadership, fell on the necks of the three notable dictators. This debacle of a revolution to overthrow a decaying monarchy perhaps had no other alternative at that time and likely fitted into the political conditions of the 18th century better than it would today.

One cannot expect much sincerity from a dictator who tries to dramatize the Gettysburg speech before an illiterate mob in the street. Any man who tries it is a political hypocrite. Yet I have heard of more than one in my own lifetime who usurped political power by

this method and got away with it. Of course in a country that never allowed the idea of a democracy to be raised as a political issue, where newspapers were taboo and where illiteracy claimed four-fifths of the adult population, a dictator, or something akin to it, would be the only possible political rule.

After spending the fall and winter months on one of the West Indies islands forty years ago, I learned that the people of that island—about a million of them—had lived their colonial life for three hundred years under the kind of government which I refer to. The largest city had a population of 40,000 and it managed to support one newspaper—a tabloid weekly issue of four pages. One Roman Catholic missionary priest looked after the spiritual welfare of these 40,000. This, in my opinion, was not only colonial political rule, it was 100 per cent neglected rule of the Spanish vintage.

A careful reading, by an impartial observer, of the history of the political, religious and social life of the inhabitants of the countries I have just mentioned, would convince him, if he thinks fast and will reason from cause to effect, that the common denominator, when applied to human intelligence the world over,

will work out as truly as it does in mathematics. The inequalities and differences apparent to everyone in the physical development and color of racial groups, cannot be considered a deciding factor in determining a question of intelligence when we try to apply it to anyone of the groups in a world population.

We have the information from travelers who explored some of the dark corners of the earth where there was human habitation. Here and there among the natives they found a degree of intelligence which might puzzle the academically trained citizen living in a more cultured environment.

Life and growth in human biology will react to the same natural law in the jungle as it does anywhere else on earth. Mother Nature seems to be quite indifferent as to whether her biologic product in human craftsmanship turns out to be a genius or an imbecile. If 50 per cent turn out to be moronic or low grade in type it will compare favorably with all other life and nothing much can be done about it.

So far as intelligence goes the world over when we apply it to the homo-sapien—modern man—there is the scientific opinion that it

has not varied much in the last 10,000 years. This opinion, if it holds water, would indicate that the record of man's civilization in each millennium of history didn't rise above a certain level in all that time. This of course would depend on the character of the tools used in the building of the structure; the inventive genius of the builder to make it better or worse than he found it.

This world never offered a greater opportunity to any part of its population than it offered to that group of hardy adventurers whom I have made the subject of this book: Pioneer landseekers who volunteered to change their habitat from an old world to a new one, a world which was as little known to them at the time than if it were a part of another planet.

Few of the adventurers realized, perhaps, that the enterprise marked an important milestone in human history. Important in the sense that it gave to the common man who was a part of this pioneer group, an outlook on life never experienced before by him or any of his ancestors or contemporaries. The life story of this same common man and his place in the history of western civilization is one of discipline and obedience to some power or

authority which held a whiphand over him—in short, a story of the struggle between master and slave.

The various forms of government set up throughout the centuries by kings and dictators were never governments with the consent of the governed. Such a thing as a bill of rights, as we understand such rights in free America, was treason—treason which invoked divine authority by both canon and civil law to inflict the death penalty on the traitor. The anomalous thing that stands out in the mind of the impartial reader of history is the fact that this brand of political and “divine authority,” in the hands of rulers on the European continent, flourished at its best from the beginning of Christianity down to the outbreak of the first World War.

This means, if it means anything at all, that the frailties of the human as represented during the period mentioned of both church and state, failed to measure up to a thesis on religious philosophy preached to the world nineteen centuries ago.

That which proved to be a curse to the people on the European continent no doubt inspired much of the immigration which came to America in boat loads during the

latter part of the 18th century. It was the desire of people in all racial groups not only to better their economic condition, but to get away from a political and religious serfdom which was never intended for the man born to think for himself and plan his own way of life. The natural right of the individual to have enough freedom and liberty to do this was an inalienable right from the beginning, and to arbitrarily suppress it, or take it away in the name of some kind of social order, is bad medicine for anyone who was taught to believe that he was "free and equal" with his brother man.

In view of the foregoing, a pointed question will arise in the mind of the reader: what would I suggest in the way of discipline and authority for the individual who is born, minus self-control and the mentality to realize that man is a social creature? Certainly, if he is to live peacefully with his fellow humans, he will have to submit to the rules of the game. One not willing to do this for the peace and safety of the common good is given no choice but to live the life of a common criminal whose ultimate goal is far from a happy one. Other unfortunates of a pathological nature, unfitted to share in the

regular duties of citizenship, become charges of the State and confined to mental hospitals.

In our quest for information on this subject nothing will bring it out as thoroughly as the medical examining boards appointed by our government when men are selected for enlistment in the military and naval services in time of war. For such services we must have the best physical types of the male population, and so far as possible, the average types of the mentally fit. There is a good reason for this, as there is no other service that is so exacting on the health and strength of the citizen soldier, and in our demilitarized democracy, the citizen soldier is elected to fight all of our wars. The latest information given to the public by these examining boards of the present war would indicate that the average physical fitness of the nation's soldier material—if we can believe the man of medicine—had taken a slump for the worse since our last war.

In the first draft of two million men the rejections were surprisingly large. But there are a number of other factors related to this question which make one hesitate to jump at conclusions. A report from a war examining board, when some other factors are consid-

ered, may not add up to anything more serious in the way of public information than a report from the weather bureau. In the last four or five decades, the health boards of the nation, with the cooperation of a public-minded medical profession, have done much to make America a scientific laboratory for public information on the art of living.

Most of this scientific knowledge, now in possession of the general public, is of quite recent origin, and includes proper sanitation in the home and the military camp as well as the discovery of the "vitamin" and its proper distribution in our food supply. Food inspection is an old one and is one of the things that helps to make life worth living.

CHAPTER III

HYPHENATED AMERICANS

LOOKING back to Theodore Roosevelt's day at the beginning of this century, the "rough-rider" President had considerable to say about the "hyphenated American." He meant that type of an individual who divided his loyalty between the land of his nativity and the land where he lived and prospered as a citizen.

When this plain-speaking President of the Republic expressed his convictions on any subject he did so in terms which would leave no doubt as to what he meant. He had an opportunity — if any President had — to know America perhaps a little better than anyone ever elected to that high office. For this reason he loved America and was ready to defend it whenever it became a subject for discussion in or out of office. He was a dynamo of strenuosity as a leader and one cannot wonder at this, for he spent a considerable part of his life astride a saddle pony as a stockraiser on the western plains. In searching for "Who's

Who" in America this rough-rider President could stand beside the "rail-splitter" Lincoln without a demurrer, claiming at least a little of the honor we assign to the latter as a great American.

"Fine," said everybody who knew and saw this human dynamo on horseback. But this was just one individual American and America—we must keep in mind—is something greater than one human personality. At the moment it happens to be a considerable part of a world's creation.

In the broadest sense of the term, everyone born on the continents of North and South America is a native and no one country, from Canada to Argentina, has a patent or exclusive monopoly on the term. A difference in political systems of government, on either continent, does not change that which one claims to be his national birthright. We don't believe the ex-president to whom we have just referred would have minced words with a hyphenated citizen on the question, no matter where he happened to be born.

Racial groups could be formed on this continent, as they were on the continent of Europe, with their own particular systems of government and cultural training handed

down to them as an ancestral inheritance. It can be admitted even at this advanced stage in our history that there are racial groups of European origin in our present population which would not hesitate to encourage such an idea if it were given sufficient political support. We must hope that no such encouragement shall be given.

There is something more than a political allegiance for citizens' rights behind all this—something more than an oath to obey the Constitution, however important this may be. Real allegiance to the setup of a government and what it stands for calls for something which lies much deeper than this in the mind and soul of the individual. Any form of government that looks forward to a more perfect union of its citizens will have to keep in mind, for a while at least, the influence of the racial group.

Those who loved their freedom and liberty among our British ancestry had to dethrone one king, send another king to the execution block and go through one carnage of a civil war before they could talk about a Bill of Rights.

It was not until after our own Civil War and the nation had settled down again to the

business of repairing the damage, that the real inflow of immigration from the continent of Europe set in. From all sections of that part of the world at least a score of different nationalities came and all were welcome without much discrimination or questioning as to who these immigrants were when they landed.

They were destined to become a part of the political and social structure of the new nation. How well they fitted into the structure is a question which we must leave to the analytical opinions of the sociologists and future historians.

Prior to this, immigration had already reached the high watermark. There was a government domain west of the Mississippi extensive enough in acreage to give the "more abundant life" to one hundred millions of persons. All that this vast domain needed, to bring it to a full fruition of its richness was the right sort of an immigrant and the fighting spirit of the early American pioneer. Many of those who came to our shores after the Civil War were city dwellers who knew little or nothing of what it took to face a wilderness with an ax on one shoulder and a shotgun under the other arm. The average city dweller nourishes the belief that there is a shorter cut

to the "more abundant life" than the trail through the forest or over the open prairie.

Question this individual on the subject and he is ready with the statement that it takes all kinds of people to make a world.

Many of our immigrants with a preference for the paved street of the city went in there and contributed their share to create a great social problem.

We believe that it is a mere waste of effort on the part of any writer to express an opinion, at this late day, on what the qualifications of those immigrants were for American citizenship. There was a background to a number of the racial groups. Inheritance — good and bad — traditions and even biology entered into it.

So when we speak of the American, as we know him today as a free man, it is essential that we take stock of the biologic change, physically and mentally, after five or ten generations in the members of those different racial groups who came here for permanent residence.

In a biologic sense we may be looking forward to something which shall be distinctly American in character and will be recognized as such by other members of an alien race,

but our opinion is that it will take something stronger than an oath of allegiance, cultural training and some wishful thinking to bring this about.

When we are dealing with things that concern created life on this earth we wonder if our puny efforts in cultural training can do much to change those traits which are distinctly Jewish, German or Irish in their character, into something that will be another type of homo sapien in a few generations.

A human world, at best, is not a stable world. When it divides or falls apart into nationalistic groups any one of those groups is likely to build a political structure under the teaching and influence of some outstanding leader in whom the mass of the people have abounding faith.

If this freedom is now considered a characteristic principle of American life, let us be honest enough to admit that it was at the beginning a child of British origin. It was the British blood led by Washington, Jefferson and Henry in colonial America that made this freedom a reality for the individual at the birth of the nation. Here and there among other racial groups there was an outstanding leader whose voice was heard and who shoul-

dered a gun and followed Washington's leadership in the Revolution.

But long before that first shot was fired in defense of freedom for America, the Greek and the Roman slave had said some pointed things on the rights of the common people. During man's lifetime on earth, freedom to think and act has never been the exclusive property of any individual or class, but the world of man has always had an individual that rose up somewhere in every epoch of history and laid claim to such an exclusive right. Sometimes if the faith of the common people for some reason was betrayed by such a person, the usual recourse to reestablish the faith was to make it appear as the instrument of "divine authority."

An apt illustration of this faith on the part of the people in their leader came over the radio in a statement from Berlin recently, in which the speaker said "God did not raise up Hitler to lead the German people for the purpose of betraying them." This may not be a verbatim translation of the exact words, but we believe it is near enough to give us the meaning of the original. To be led by a leader in whom his followers have put their faith into a political bypath that spells ruin is an

extremely unfortunate thing for any racial group. No informed person on racial history will admit that the German people as a whole, are unintelligent.

The history of this race on the European continent from barbarism at the beginning of the Christian era down to the reign of Frederick the Great, furnishes plenty of evidence that these people were in the van of progress among other racial groups on that continent. There was little to inspire the generation that grew up in Germany after the first World War. Had America been faced with a similar situation, with its political, economic and social structure smashed to smithereens, one cannot be sure that our American statesmen of the present day would have proved invulnerable to the causes which led not only the people of Germany, but several other racial groups on that continent, into the unknown results of a Revolution.

We are trying to bring about on this continent an American civilization which we hope will not lead us into such a cataclysm of destruction every few generations. To do this it is very essential that we keep in mind the record of past civilizations and the causes which led to their decline and fall. We be-

lieve that it is possible for a well informed democracy to keep its social order working smoothly enough to eventually reach the desired aim of self-government.

From the time the first immigrants landed on the shores of this continent no people of the world have had the opportunity to learn from experience the causes which led to the failure of other systems of government. In a democracy these are lessons which must be learned by every normal and intelligent citizen if the democracy is to keep on its feet.

In short, the new conditions and the new problems which faced the immigrant from another land demanded a complete and irrevocable break with the past. For some of the racial groups that came to us from the continent of Europe this was something which could not be accomplished over-night. It goes without saying that the change to meet conditions was not difficult for the British immigrant. He merely had to hang up his "at" and make himself at home.

He spoke our language, read our newspapers, and before he landed had some knowledge of American customs and ways of living. With exceptions to this among some of the racial groups from the European continent,

the introduction to America was a more difficult one. With the exception of some very rare individual cases that slipped in through the back door, little or no complaint from an intelligent and informed viewpoint of American public opinion could be charged against any considerable number of the European immigrants, especially against those who came in the trying days of colonial history.

When the flood-tide of immigration poured in from Europe later on it was natural and, we might say, primitively instinctive for some of the racial groups to hold onto something which had been a part of their life for maybe a thousand generations. If these groups were inclined to herd together in colonies and perpetuate their native language in preference to our American English and with all the other culture of their former habitat, it might be considered a good defense for this attitude to say, "this was free America." But to encourage this in cultural training for citizenship pointed to the very thing referred to by Theodore Roosevelt.

CHAPTER IV

BRITISH SUPREMACY

THERE was more than one reason why the adult immigrant from any country of the old world should break with the past if he intended to live the rest of his life in the new world. Members of the first settlers who blazed the trails through the wilderness for those who followed should have little difficulty in this respect. The word "psychology" no doubt was just a sleeping word in the dictionary for most of the immigrants at the time, as the new life with its problems would naturally create new thoughts which in time would unconsciously replace the old. It is unnecessary to say that these new problems which the first settlers had to face were sufficient in themselves to keep the mind fully occupied. A political or religious philosophy, with its controversial viewpoint although interesting perhaps to one traveling in that direction, would be given little thought by the man with an ax on his shoulder traveling in a different direction.

It is sound psychologic reasoning to say that the human mind will not react successfully to more than one line of thought at a time. Moreover, it is psychologically true that when the mind takes a vacation from a subject which has occupied it for a protracted length of time at the expense of other kinds of thought, it is good mental medicine—physical recreation for some overworked braincells.

There may be some question as to how and where America obtained so much of the freedom and liberty which the average citizen of this country enjoys. To hold that all of it was handed down to him as an inheritance from a particular racial group that dominated the political fortunes of the country during the first period of European immigration wouldn't be quite true.

The principle of freedom and liberty in itself has no political boundaries and will thrive anywhere on earth where it is given the opportunity to express itself. As a principle of life it cannot be made the monopoly of any racial group, but it had been completely destroyed time and time again during the period of western civilization by the tyranny of despotic governments.

That period which seems to have ended at the close of the war of 1418 on the European continent was a period during which political and religious authority either neglected entirely the interests of the common people or subjected them to a governmental system which left the great mass of them mental slaves to this authority.

For centuries on that continent those in position of power and authority, and perhaps without being aware of it, were playing with dynamite. The explosion came in 1914 and tore civilization, what there was of it, into shreds. A batch of "isms" arose from the wreckage which the promoters honestly believed would change a continent of warring nations into a pastoral scene where the lion and the lamb would lie down together and sing hymns of praise. But unfortunately for the peace of the rest of the world, those "isms" turned out to be merely more political dynamite prepared for another explosion.

This, of course, was not true of the vast majority of European immigrants. Large numbers of them never required the use of a "melting pot" to blend them into good Americans.

The first hundred years of colonial life in

this "land of the free" comprised very much the period of the pioneers.

The clearing of the land and the cultivation of the soil was the occupation of nine-tenths of the population. What business or commerce there was between organized communities was chiefly one of "barter and trade." Business for a time in the Old Dominion—the Virginia colony—used tobacco for cash in the bank as a medium of exchange. It was a health-breathing outdoor life most of the time for those early settlers. A little strenuous perhaps for the timid soul who lacked courage to face it but a glorious prospect for the man on horseback looking towards the western horizon.

The "melting pot" was a utensil of good intentions, but human biology, like all other biologies which have to deal with the question of life and growth, is not likely to leave the beaten path of natural law. Today, after ten or twelve generations, living and dying on the soil of America, the characteristics of each racial group that make up our population, are still easily distinguishable. Not only in physical stature and facial expression, but in accents of speech. This is easily to be observed in the United States where the population

still consists very largely one of immigrants. We have only to look back over the racial history of mankind for the past 5000 years to determine whether there has been any success with a social biology which would reduce the different racial groups of our nation to a common denominator. That is a process which would have made these different groups into homogenous generations of Americans.

The natural science of all life on this earth does not furnish us with any convincing evidence that Mother Nature uses up any of her time as a miracle worker. There is evidence, however, for those observing enough to see it, that Mother Nature in her biology of life and growth, does work independently of human inventions and in complete harmony with the divine law of creation. The United States of America is unique among all other nations of the world in the sense that every racial group had an equal opportunity to put its best foot forward on its arrival in the country and prove to all the other groups that it had credentials in its brief case to show that it was a nation builder.

The impartial historian of colonial settlements, by each racial group and the extent of the imprint stamped by each one of these

groups on the political, religious and social structure of the nation, is a subject that is too familiar to be repeated to those who have lived and have been a part of its every day life.

Each group brought something which would be a permanent value to a nation destined to become the first world democracy where the individual could hold his chin up and breathe the wholesome air of freedom and liberty.

While this trail was being blazed by the pioneer for new settlements and the log cabins built for the beginnings of family life, little time could be given by the "hewers of wood and the drawers of water" to the more complicated problems important to an organized community.

Moreover, there were related political questions to this beginning of a social order which stood out in the minds of some of the colonists as the real purposes which brought them to the new world.

The birth of a nation is usually a slow one, and perhaps it was greatly to the advantage of our American democracy that there was a lapse of one hundred and fifty years between the landing of the *Mayflower* at Plymouth

Rock and the constitutional convention at Philadelphia.

There was an opportunity during all of this time and under some form of colonial government to give rise to more than one school of political thought. The influence of different racial groups—mostly from the continent of Europe — very naturally created political viewpoints which clashed when they met in debate at colonial assemblies. But the impartial historians of Colonial America have made it clear to the reader of the school textbook that the British colonist, who was first on the ground and who brought his political ideas of government with him as the most important part of his luggage, succeeded in dominating the political will of the colonists, whether they lived on a New England farm or on a Southern Plantation.

With all due credit to other racial groups for what culture they contributed to the national structure, it would seem to be a redundancy of words to repeat the influence of British supremacy in this early period of our national life. This British supremacy had been, with the passing of years, the result of political rivalry with foreign powers. Be that as it may, the reader of history also knows

that it had the weight of centuries behind it in a civil strife to determine whether government was to be a question of the fullest freedom possible for the individual as a way of life—or something which went back to the barbaric age of master and slave.

The three great powers of the western world at that time were England, France and Spain.

During the first hundred years of immigration each of these in its explorations and settlements spent a great part of time in dealing with hostile Indians.

Britain and France were rivals for possession of territory and confined themselves to that part of North America extending from the gulf of Mexico to the Arctic ocean; Spain mostly to Central and South America. What influence the three powers have exerted upon the individual we like to call the "American" can be measured by what we now see after twelve generations of settlement on American soil. Each of these groups, together with others which followed them from the European continent, make up the pattern of the picture of our democracy. However, each one of those national groups calls for a more

lengthy treatment than I have in mind to bring out the lights and shadows of a picture that is distinctly racial in character.

CHAPTER V

THE FIGHT FOR A CONTINENT

EXPLORATION and discovery, before and after the Columbus voyage in any part of the world, was usually followed by a right of possession. Spain, during the period referred to in the last chapter, raised her flag over considerable territory on both continents. But this happy-go-lucky country of Cervantes either failed as a colonizer or was not strong enough in a military or political sense to wage war against her two rivals, France and England in the Northern hemisphere. It was not until after the United States had established a government of its own and had acquired practically all of the rights of possession to the territory east of the Mississippi river that she gave up her last acre of land north of the Rio Grand.

But when Spain packed her bag and turned to the more tropical land of the southern hemisphere she gained something in world prestige which was much more valuable to her from a cultural viewpoint than a terri-

torial possession. With one exception—that of Brazil—she made her musical castillian tongue the official language of the people of all that southern hemisphere.

The importance of a language in a cultural sense can be emphasized when it opens the door to an historical background of the everyday life of the people. This is an instrument more powerful in effect on the lives of the common people than a military conquest.

Communication between the individual and his fellow man was the first step towards the organized community. Nomadic man had to invent a language of some sort before he could arrive at any success in this direction.

One who is alert to the importance of a question of this character in community life will not hesitate to give Spain credit with something greater than a territorial possession, when she gave the greater part of the population of a continent the language of Cervantes, the official language of the common people of the continent to the south of us.

There is no bond that will get down into the heart and soul of a people as effectively as the bond of a common language between different nationalities. The British dominions and the United States owe much of their com-

mon understanding and good neighborly feeling to their common inheritance in the language of Shakespeare.

This is something to remember by those who are inclined to put emphasis on the right of different racial groups of foreign nativity for each to continue the language, traditions and ideologies of its native land, whether or not those things be in conflict with the established order of American life.

The triumph of English speech on the North American continent as the dominating language of the common people and official communication cannot be appraised too highly as an agency for unity of thought on all matters which were of serious concern to the life and growth of the new nation.

The Anglo-Saxon pioneer in the settlement of the continent was the man on horseback—the man who blazed the trails and spoke plain English to both savage and civilized with accents of authority.

There is evidence of this British dominating influence throughout the entire period of our colonial history. We don't need to explain that the continent, or that part of it north of the Rio Grand, is now divided between two English-speaking nations living side by side

in peace and harmony as an example to the rest of a very quarrelsome world. Both nations have a twin background — not only in the British political strife for freedom and liberty for the common man, but in tradition, folklore and fable, running back to the ancient past of a sturdy and unconquered race.

There is something akin to immortality in a race of people whose territory has been invaded on and off for two thousand years at different times, but which has never been given to successful conquest by any one of the various invaders.

Even as successful a conqueror as Julius Caesar failed to make the land of Boadicea—the ancient British queen—the habitat of the Roman or that of a Roman descendant. When the invader landed and remained for a few generations he either returned to his native land or was swallowed up in the course of time by the stronger race of British blood and British biology.

After all of the elements—beginning with the landing of the Mayflower—were taken into account, the British way of life was destined to make that which was to be the American civilization as we know it today, a social, religious and political pattern, which

would fit into the picture of British civilization.

This original blueprint of a social order for a new world was in the mind only as a dream of freedom-loving people in the mother land for centuries before, and now was the hope of a practical thing in the new life before them. But it must never be forgotten that every group of men and women who pledge collectively to do something as a united organization, is first, last and always, a group of individuals. This fact was uppermost in the minds of those who met at Philadelphia a century or more later for the purpose of putting the new kind of unity to a test. And it was no less a person than Benjamin Franklin who said, "If we don't hang together on this question, I can assure you we will hang separately." There is evidence to be found in the archives at Washington that those native sons of America (mostly of British decent) did "hang together", until their efforts brought into being the birth of a great nation. That birth, we must admit, was more maternal in its love and forgiveness than the grown-up child was willing to acknowledge. However, this unwillingness of the child to acknowledge its indebtedness can be charged

to those members of the family who regarded Mother England as just a stepmother.

It is a rare stepmother who can hold the good will of every member of the family. But the mother of nations and the mother of parliaments, so far as the rest of the world was concerned, could be given credit for having this field entirely to herself for centuries. If exception is taken to this, we would ask the critic to name another nation which might be classed as a world power carrying on a stable government for the past three hundred years that did as much for a better way of life in our western civilization. If her wars in any part of the world were considered wars of conquest, by the historian, they were usually the discipline of a stable government being exercised over a more or less unstable one. When it was not this, it was where the established government of a nation—like that of India—went to pieces in an insurrection of its people and the “mother of parliaments” was called in as a peace-maker.

After this happened it was necessary (in order to tame down the rebellious factions that were ready to cut each other's throats) to establish something in the way of a benevolent despotism—and this really has been

the British rule in India for a century or more. The rule, for a number of reasons largely racial and religious in character, has been a sort of a "Hobson's choice" for the people of that ancient empire.

This advisory and governmental rule set up where it became necessary on the part of the mother of parliaments was much more successful with the colonial settlements in South Africa. And let me add that the other members of the English-speaking nations of the Empire are in a position to speak for themselves on the subject.

That part of the continent of North America lying north of the 49th parallel of latitude and east of Alaska, and now known as the Dominion of Canada, quite an important part of the British Empire, was ceded by France to Britain in a treaty signed at Utrecht in the year 1759 and brought to an end the war between the two countries for territorial possessions on this continent.

However, this treaty did not require France to remove from British territory the subjects of its French king. Quite a substantial French settlement had acquired a good foothold on the lower St. Lawrence river and was later charted on the Dominion map as the Province

of Quebec. It was in the vicinity of Quebec city that the battle of Abraham Plains was fought—the last battle between the two rival powers.

Here a French civilization was built to the exclusion of almost everything that was British in character.

The French language was jealously retained—not only as the language of the common people, but as the official speech in public life. I am of the opinion that if this Province could be picked up from the surface of the earth, carried across the Atlantic and set down anywhere in the motherland, it would fit into the picture perfectly. The racial clanishness to stick to the traditions, beliefs and social culture peculiarly its own, happens to be weighted down by the customs and behaviors of centuries that have become too much of a fixture to be upset over-night. Nevertheless, it must be regarded as a stumbling block to the unity of a nation.

The metropolis of the province—Montreal, has quite a large English-speaking population, but let this group of citizens suggest a popular vote, for example, on a change from French to English as the official language

of the school system, and my guess is that the proposition would be turned down.

However, Quebec is only one province in the Dominion. There are eight others in which the English language is the language of the home and the school. So there is no quarrel sufficiently grave unto itself to break up a mode of life that is too deep-rooted in character and perhaps would accomplish nothing if it were changed into something different.

There was an 'exodus after the war of another group of these settlers from Arcadia—the colonial French name for Nova Scotia—to what was at that time the territory of Louisiana—a French possession which at that time comprised most of the land west of the Mississippi and north to what is now the Canadian border. When we set up house-keeping for ourselves we bought this vast territory from France for the price of a few airplanes, a transaction which seemed to have inspired our chin-bearded Uncle Sam to pick up on a Russian bargain-counter another tract of land equal in square miles to that part of the United States east of the Mississippi and lying to the northwest of the British dominions on the Pacific.

At the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, it will be noted that the competition for colonization and settlement of the continent left the British, or Anglo-Saxon, controlling or dominating about ninety per cent of it.

CHAPTER VI

EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION

PREVIOUS to 1776 the thirteen crown colonies, six of them referred to on the map as "New England," were tied to the mother country by charter agreements.

When this tie was broken as a result of the Revolution there were approximately three million people in those colonies who were ready to take on the responsibilities of an organized government of their own. A second look at those first Americans—if we can call them that—is necessary before we "tar them all with the same stick." Many generations will come and go before we can do that, before we can become as homogenous in appearance to the observer at a first glance, as we do when we look at a Chinaman or an Indian.

An official census at the present time would show that we have representatives from almost every racial group on earth in our population. I am not one who believes that this large

number of racial groups is destined sometime in the far off future to be blended in some natural way into a distinct American. There are sociological reasons which are very deeprooted in the minds of different racial groups that are at war with this idea and which are apt to remain so for the time being. But does this social exclusiveness, on the part of some of the races, give them an exclusive right by nativity or naturalization to the name "American?"

Four or five generations—descendants of the first party of immigrants from the British Isles—had accomplished something for America prior to the Revolution, which no others from the continent of Europe (for obvious reasons) were capable of doing. Like Caesar, they came, they saw, they conquered—not just territory—for that was here already as a natural gift offered to anyone who could successfully explore it and settle it with inhabitants. These descendants of British pioneers in the colonial period of our history had been schooled in the cultural institutions of Anglo-Saxon civilization. It was a part of the luggage brought over on the *Mayflower* and, as time passed, became the label which was stamped on the political, religious and

social trend of American life on the greater part of this continent.

After we had declared our independence we notified the mother country that we had grown up mentally and no longer required her advice on matters which had become distinctly American in character. Not that we had left behind us inherited traditions of British civilization, for this would have been a distinct loss. The alpha and omega of the basic things in our American civilization were handed over to us in a blueprint which outlined the pattern which later became our national structure.

~~We are quite aware that~~ there are those of other races in our present population who are quite ready to take issue with me on this question. But the facts are too firmly established in American history for any well informed American citizen who might be inclined to question them.

When an entire hemisphere was made available for settlement and colonization and the free-footed and free-minded people of the rest of the world rushed in to "come and get it," it was everything but a local incident. There were wrapped up in such an enterprise all of the elements which create war,

racial hatreds, religious bigotry and unending economic strife. This is the ugly side of the picture; but I'm afraid it is also that which seems to be the very natural behavior of humanity as we see it in the world of today.

The migration of millions of human beings from the Old World to the New and the effect which this migration produced later on western civilization was, without doubt, the greatest event that ever happened in human history.

It was a movement in the life of mankind on this earth in which the chains of physical and mental slavery were broken and the individual told that he had some inalienable rights which no power on earth could deny him. Slavery of any sort, physical or mental, was never intended as an essential thing in human life. Yet all through the centuries of western civilization — down to within the present century here in America, physical slavery played an important part in our economic life. God had to create a Lincoln before this moral stain could be wiped from the escutcheon of a country that called itself a Christian nation.

But there has always been a question in my mind as to whether the physical was ever

a worse brand of slavery than the mental. One who knows his psychology is aware that a person born for leadership in his community can be reduced to a state of mental slavery when someone in high authority and in whom this person has absolute faith, exercises his psychologic discipline and keeps it hanging over his victim's head like the sword of Damocles.

I have seen much of this brand of mental discipline worked out in practice in my own experience and sometimes very much to the disadvantage of the victim over whom it was exercised. The problem is one which should be of uppermost interest to those in charge of our educational system.

I recall a case of physical discipline of some years ago in which the father of a ten-year-old boy was using a horsewhip on the bare back of his victim for some trivial fracture of parental discipline. We protested the brutality of such treatment but the parent retorted, "I'll break that boy's will, or I'll break his back." Our reply to this remark was, "If you break his will, you might just as well break his back." The passion to rule and dominate a fellow creature is a deep-seated one in human nature, but we haven't much

evidence that it has ever been regarded as a cardinal virtue.

In this hemispheric movement we were dealing with more than one racial group. Moreover, in such a movement, the question of freedom and liberty was in the mind of every individual taking part in it. In a large sense it was nomadic humanity again in its raw state which called for wisdom and wise counsel after the Revolution. Fortunately for the organized government set up by its leaders there was no lack at the time of such counsel and leadership.

Prior to the war between the states the immigration from the continent of Europe was only a trickling stream. What little there was emanated from the countries of Scandinavia and the British Isles.

This gave the dominant British element in the population time to establish its language, its system of jurisprudence—based on the English Common Law—and an educational system which would reach everyone and which would reduce illiteracy to the vanishing point.

Of course at that time in our history universal education for the mass of the people met opposition so strong in some sections that

Horace Mann, the founder of our public school system, while on a lecture tour in the New England states one hundred years ago, was threatened by a street mob.

Today this would be inconceivable anywhere in America. Our Republic had enjoyed half a century of growth by that time and a lot of very good people were becoming more or less sensitive about their Bill of Rights. A man who went into an untamed wilderness with an ax on his shoulder and blazed a trail to a spot where he planned to build his log cabin would not be considered a weakling, either physically or mentally. The majority of the first immigrants had to begin life in America with this kind of prospect before them.

The overflow of immigration from the continent of Europe after the war between the states created an unlooked-for problem which called for some form of restrictive legislation.

Congress passed an act after some pressure was brought to bear on it by public opinion, but despite it the flood of immigration continued until it became necessary to amend it in a manner that would cut down the quotas of certain races who were undesirable, it was argued, on account of their cultural back-

ground which would not fit into the pattern of the American way of life. Or to make it plainer, too large a quota of these Europeans were found to be invulnerable to radical changes or to respond easily to a civilization that was largely Anglo-Saxon in origin. This, as we have already observed, had become a truism of our social order before the population had reached the fifty million mark. In short, our political structure had the hall-mark of an English-speaking nation.

This is something which should be extremely important to the American historian because, had each immigrant race done what the French had done when they settled in the Dominion of Canada, we could easily have had a political map similar to that of continental Europe, with a score or more different nationalities.

When large numbers of these nationalities embarked for a change of habitat no encouragement was given to any of them to transplant their particular brands of state-craft to the free soil of America. There was sound reason for this and care was taken to prevent it, in the statesmanship ruling convention which met at Philadelphia when the Constitution was written.

America was free to any individuals of good character who realized the value of freedom, but it was not free to those desiring to implant their own political brand of government within the territory of one which had already been established to the entire satisfaction of its citizens.

Continental Europe allowed this sort of thing to take root at the beginning of its political history and by doing so created an incentive for recurring wars. There is such a thing as sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind and the people of Europe seemed to have made such a practice throughout its entire history.

The man who knows his biology, or who believes he does, will say that this is inevitable—that it is something which is beyond human control and part of the original program, observed by one who follows the beaten path of natural law. But this is giving credit to a law, said to be inexorable—unchangeable and deadly to the evolution of everything that has life and growth, as it was originally planned by the Creator.

But mankind as a whole perhaps is destined to blunder along in its human activities, sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind with

continuous wars, thereby halting all progress towards that coveted peace and good will so essential to a better way of life.

CHAPTER VII

RACIAL HATRED

MUCH or little may be said on the subject of racial hatred, depending on the particular viewpoint. But when this emotion of the race is criss-crossed with the whole social fabric to the extent that it is a stumbling block to unity, it is not to be wondered at that some people give it a good deal of attention.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself" is an aphorism of the Bible, but this divine admonition in a world where human behavior is what we know it to be today, is as pragmatic as telling someone that the lamb should be put into the same cage with the hungry lion. The king of beasts may not have any hatred in its heart for as innocent a creature as the lamb, used by the Bible writer as the symbol of non-resistance. When the latter comes within reach of powerful claws it ceases to be a question of love or hatred. It is merely the gluttonous satisfaction that a sumptuous Sunday dinner has been dragged home to the lair.

This may easily be brushed aside in referring to it as an essential requirement in the biology of animal life; but when we do this, we hasten to acknowledge at the same time that man is something more than a mere animal. In his likeness to his Creator, he is supposed to be tamed down in his hatred towards his fellow creature for any cause and to make this a social habit of his life.

When we speak of freedom and liberty we have in mind the natural state of the individual before he has submitted to any form of discipline imposed upon him by an organized state. Absolute freedom for the individual is, of course, impossible if there is to be any peace in this very human world. Even the rebellious three-year-old was made aware of this after his first spanking by an impatient mother.

There are limits to self-government and those limits begin with the young hopeful in the nursery, who thinks in terms of treason to any and all parental authority.

But this has been the cry of the individual throughout the ages. The problem of all governments is a problem of compromises. When it is not that, it is just the decrees of an autocrat and those decrees in a darker age were doubly autocratic when they were hand-

ed down stamped with the assumption of divine authority, making any right of appeal, by anyone who even dared to suggest it, an act of treason or blasphemy.

This was the political background of most of the races that migrated to America from the continent of Europe. I might add that if this brand of government were traced back to its more primitive origin in human civilization, black magic and religious superstition would be the main arguments offered for the discipline of the uncivilized. Of course if there was a civilization of some sort there would have to be a beginning somewhere along the trail and black magic and religious superstition were powerful weapons in the hands of one who usurped the power to rule.

When we are dealing with such problems in the world of today we must never lose sight of the fact that they are more or less related to similar problems which have confronted civilized man since he took upon himself the responsibility of organized government. No historian will attempt to deny that the primary interest in the mind of every race that came to America—singly and collectively—first and foremost was the question of freedom and liberty.

But there were a number of other things ostensibly less important. Yet there was evidence of a personal interest in those belongings too closely attached to the life of each group that they couldn't just be thrown aside like a worn-out garment. These were in truth a part of the ingrained character of the particular race.

Before any of them could follow in step with the parade of American citizenship, patience and tolerance for these racial habits on the part of everyone who had acquired his American way of life by generations of American nativity were, under the circumstances, matters of supreme necessity.

One or two generations of genetic biology in a different atmosphere and social environment would make little change in habits of life whose origin probably could be traced back a thousand generations.

Similarly there are bonds which link the individual to his own race which are much stronger than anything that he might find in the way of help from philosophic textbooks on "naturalization and citizenship."

Those bonds that link the habits of life to the old and the new and which are so deep-rooted and natural in character, furnished the

excuse for the criticism referred to in a preceding chapter as "hyphenated Americans" by our late rough-rider President.

For half a century or more, while the various racial groups increased in numbers by virtues of a very liberal immigration law, there was a tendency on their part to get together in some sort of an alliance which might help to keep alive the kinship they still owed to their native land. Germans, Italians and Poles were conspicuous leaders in this movement which not only branded them as "hyphenates," but aroused a spirit of racial hatred among a class of Americans who could not tolerate a divided loyalty of patriotism on any terms.

In one overflow of immigration we received about half the population of Ireland, which at the time totalled about 8,000,000. This Irish group—especially those of the Roman Catholic faith—was among the first to parade the hyphenated name for its group of immigrants, and if we know the Irish, they are apt to be the last to abandon the use of the hyphenate. Their centuries of hate for everything that is English in character may in a sense be responsible for this. But that is another story and one which more than once played

an interesting role in the annals of Irish and British relations.

The hatred of the Irish for the English has endured for centuries. Of course there is an underlying cause for this, just as there is for everything that happens in the evolution and growth of the civilized state. No one knowing the facts will attempt to deny that this hatred started and has been fostered very largely by a difference in origin of those two groups which can be traced as far back as the invasion of the Romans.

No one in particular can be held responsible for this, but someone is responsible for a geographical division of the island which, no doubt, can be attributed to the question of racial hatred, to a seventeenth-century uncompromising difference of opinion between church authorities on the interpretation and translation of the Scriptures.

The Irish race as a whole is impulsively generous and kind-hearted by nature. But when roused to anger over a difference with a neighbor he is more apt to reach for his shillalee and bat this neighbor over the head than to quietly sit down and reason things out with him. Here in America we sometimes meet an individual of this race even after the third or

fourth generation under American influence—who likes to boast that he is still an Irishman. This kind of talk is perhaps what inspired the late President Eliot of Harvard University to remark, in an article he published in a New York monthly, that we would never be able to turn an Irishman, by the regular process of biologic culture and training, into an American. Of course he could be eliminated by intermarriage with the German or the Japanese race.

It would be tempting to turn this phase of the subject into a humorous strain were it not for the fact that it is a very serious matter which concerns the unity and stability of the American nation. If we are dedicated to the proposition of building a self-governing democracy we shall have to discourage the organization of racial groups and alliances which divide the thinking mind of the population on questions which have already been settled and are now a part of our democracy.

The organization of racial groups within the nation, give excuse for racial hatreds.

The man who wrote the preamble to the American Constitution and who used the words, "We the people, in order to form a more perfect union, to provide for the com-

mon defense," and so on, we take it for granted excluded from his mind the idea of alliances and racial groups. This was something which belonged to the continent of Europe and which made that continent a country of national boundaries, passports and a babel of racial languages which were the very best means for stimulating unending wars. That way of life may be an inevitable thing to the people of continental Europe, but it will never fit into the pattern of the political and social philosophy of free America. Moreover, it is something which should never be encouraged to take root and grow under the auspices of any organized group able to plead its cause on the ground that this is "free America."

But is it not true that some of these races have been putting their own interpretation on our somewhat abused terminology, "free America?"

In a large industrial city of the Middle West an unusual thing happened which may be of some interest to those who are inclined to translate "American freedom" by giving the words an interpretation never intended by the framers of the Constitution.

This city happens to be one of the oldest in the United States and is nearing the two

million mark in population. Being a great industrial center it naturally became a magnet of attraction for the skilled and unskilled labor of continental Europe. Not until very recently, as everyone knows, did our government do anything to restrict this kind of labor by putting up the bars against immigration. There were two reasons for this government restriction. One was a labor market unable to take care of the surplus unemployed. The other, a discovery by the sociologist of the mystical melting-pot—even after the native crop of a second and third generation.

There was little evidence of progress in the biology of certain racial groups that they were fast becoming a race of typical Americans. However, one of the score of those groups with two hundred thousand or more in number, took the matter in hand, settled the question of loyalty to the American way of life by gathering its people together in one locality, secured a charter and incorporated a city within the corporate limits of the industrial city referred to, and did exactly what the French did when they stood out for the same brand of self-determination in the Dominion of Canada.

To emphasize the European culture of this

particular group it made its own native language the official language of its city government, the teaching language for the children sent to its parochial school and the same for the newspaper that went into the homes of its citizens.

CHAPTER VIII

BARRIERS TO UNITY

TO refer to this subject from another viewpoint than that given in the preceding chapter it is necessary to consider some of the natural reactions of human behavior when it meets up with things that go against the grain.

When this happens the average individual is roused to anger even when the cause is one of the most trivial. Mark that I have said the average individual—the really civilized man has more self-control and can rise above the pain of a pin-prick. The spirit of anger is a deadly thing when it is roused to a degree of emotional hate that it could kill on sight the one responsible for it. Emotional hate is one of the strongest instincts of the human species and when it runs amuck that person becomes a menace to the social behavior of community life.

When a racial group, or what was called the tribe in an earlier period of race history, went on the war path, that kind of anarchy usually meant the wholesale slaughter of hu-

man life on the battlefield. Hate for the individual or the group for one reason or another can usually be traced to the lack of a better understanding. When this barrier is hurdled by individuals, states and nations, there will be some hope for the poet's dream of a federation of the world and a parliament of man.

In the parade of Americanism anywhere and at all times the most common expression heard when this question is raised is, "This is free America." But this should not be taken too literally, for the expression cannot be translated into a license for anyone who has the inclination to become an outlaw. Anyone who considers himself a citizen of the organized state is under certain obligations which take from him a part of this freedom. It goes without saying that there cannot be any such thing as a social order where the individual recognizes no law except that which he sets up for himself.

In the world as we know it today the race that draws a boundary line around itself within the territory of a nation where it is already established smears itself with all of the earmarks of alienation and sedition.

In a frank discussion of the question any group inclined to take this attitude, where

America is concerned, is ready to offer a number of reasons for it. Practically all of the first generations of immigrants who landed in America from the European continent came, as we have already observed, with their own particular brand of culture which very naturally had something to do with holding these groups apart in America, as they were held apart on the continent of Europe for a thousand generations.

Anglo-American civilization, both in Canada and the United States, may have to wait for a few more generations before the racial groups of European nativity who are now citizens will drop their hyphenated loyalties and declare themselves full-fledged Americans. There are certain activities of a social and political character attributed to more than one of the groups which seemed to have slowed down the progress expected of them towards Americanism when they took their oaths of allegiance.

Any native or liberal-minded American can easily excuse the European immigrant of the first generation when he is inclined to get together with members of his own race for any activity not inimical in character to those

things which have been established by our government as the American way of life.

Any attempt to displace these things which Americans desire to perpetuate as a social and political order by any European group who thinks it has something better, is not likely to get anywhere with it regardless of the merit it may possess.

On the other hand, there is no reason why any super-patriot should become jittery, so long as the European racial group in our population confines itself to the usual program of any social affair which its members may have in mind at the time. However, when these gatherings become exclusive to others or try to perpetuate or hand down to the next generation a brand of European culture which will not fit into the American pattern, there is a breach created in national unity that calls down on the heads of this particular group some deserved criticism.

We have been told that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." While this is an essential admonition which the people of a democracy should never forget, there is something else that is a corollary to this and fully as important to keep in mind.

The freedom of the individual without

check or hindrance is a fundamental right in a natural world. But civilized man is not living in a natural world. He left that world thousands of years ago and entered one which took from a large part of that which he believed were his inalienable rights and handed him back, in exchange as the price of his liberty, the privileges of a well-ordered society.

Human nature being what it is, there will always be a pitched battle between individual freedom and the authority of government in the organized state. Perhaps the best thing that happened in the life of a people who now calls itself American, was the hundred and fifty years experience with colonial government which preceded Independence, and the written Constitution that made a nation out of thirteen ~~badly governed~~ colonies. Badly governed for two good reasons; reasons which are too well known to be repeated to any one familiar with American history.

But the bad in any of the things in life's experiences will sometimes furnish the inspiration that gives birth to the good.

The birth of a self-governing democracy in the wilds of America was the unwelcome child of a European autocrat.

Moreover, the well known English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, who was inclined to speak ex cathedra on such questions to college students in the latter part of the nineteenth century, held to the belief that the unwanted child would never grow up.

The English philosopher could tell the world—especially the world in which he himself lived—a few things on the subject of materialistic science, but this very learned man in his own particular school of thought, seemed to be just speculating on political theories when he arrived at the conclusion that the American democracy would never live to grow up to maturity. It is possible that his extremely pragmatic mind had dwelt too long on the rise and fall of European governments, where for centuries the word “democracy” had little or no meaning in the vocabulary of the common people.

Faith in a thing which takes possession of the human mind as an ideal, or something to look forward to, may turn out to be the fabled gold at the foot of the rainbow for those who make the effort to secure it. But even so, isn't that effort life's greatest adventure? It is a poor brand of philosophy that will tell the nation-builders that the blueprint from which

they are working will mean the collapse of the structure before the job is finished, unless it has a blueprint which has in it the elements of a perfect structure. Our American democracy was given a good blueprint by those who drafted it, but like all products of the human mind, the first draft was not perfect. There was a call for amendments and this call is likely to continue as the nation grows in stature and political wisdom. When we the people approach a more perfect union and the clash of political opinion and racial hatreds becomes milder in tone, the American democracy, with the passing of generations, will grow milder in tone and good biology will be able to grow two individuals labeled Americanism, where only one grew before.

CHAPTER IX

BONDS OF UNITY

WITH the slogan "This is a free country" to encourage them, there are elements in our national unity that would gladly overthrow the political structure of our democracy, if enough followers of such an idea would be mustered to achieve that purpose.

The most natural source of this kind of a disturbance in our political structure would be among that element in our population that is either too dumb to understand the principles on which our government is founded, or who, deep down in its heart, has a hatred for everything in the way of government based on Anglo-American institutions.

There is an interesting comment on record somewhere—I cannot for the moment remember it and must trust my memory—which is attributed to William E. Gladstone, who said after he had read the Constitution of the United States of America, "That is the greatest instrument for the government of a free people ever struck off by the hand of man."

We do not have to tell the well-informed American that William E. Gladstone was the great English liberal of the nineteenth century. This instrument, with its amendments, necessary to keep step with the evolution and expansion of a growing concern, has stood the test of one hundred and fifty years, with a challenge to all other countries of the world to put up a better record. At least the great English statesman saw it in that light.

If we were to give a list of things that help to make people stick together as a nation, live together as good neighbors, and thank God for the right to do so, this famous document would head the list as the foremost bond for such a purpose.

There are other bonds which help to unite us as a nation, but the Constitution with its Bill of Rights and other amendments, is a written contract legally enacted and made the supreme law of the land between the people and their government never to be changed or violated without the people's consent.

The document was written in the plain language of the people — the language of the mother country handed down to the native born American not only as the official language of the nation, but a bond of communica-

tion which helps to break down the barriers between racial groups and discourages the teaching of any other language but English in our public schools. The only person or institution that would challenge this policy of making the English language the language of the American home, the American school and American public life, is the individual of uncertain nationality who would like to see the map of the United States turned into a map of continental Europe. It is not easy to neighbor with a man who must have an interpreter to translate your language into some European dialect.

Easy communication invites a better and a more cordial understanding. It is a bond of unity next to the principles laid down for all citizens in our written Constitution.

If we desire a democracy that will function smoothly in all of its operations, the first essential step in this direction would seem to be a school of thought pragmatic enough in a philosophy of human rights that would bar no one from its classroom who desired to be an American.

It can be said with considerable truth that there were very few adult immigrants who left their native land in the Old World for the

free land of America who didn't leave behind them some form of slavery—mental or physical—which had been the curse of their race for many generations.

Any people that would submit supinely to that sort of a political and social order for generations was a people who had been schooled in the belief and faith that this was a condition ordained by God from the beginning and that it would be treason to the state and blasphemy to a divine plan to revolt against it. This kind of rule, as it appeals to the twentieth century American, is the other extreme of a rule ordained by a great leader in his speech at Gettysburg; a speech, incidently, that is intoned by an ever-ringing liberty bell to a freedom-loving people throughout the entire world.

It took revolution after revolution in most of the countries of continental Europe to break the chains of mental slavery which forced the great mass of the common people to bow in obedience for a thousand years to the tyranny, not only of the political state, but also the Christian church. To make this form of government easier for the man on the throne all academic training for the common people was omitted from the program.

No one—unless he still has a lingering instinct of nomadic man in his system—will take issue with the proposition of authority when chaos and insurrection threaten law and order of the political state. He who ignores this is indifferent to any form of discipline prescribed by authority for the preservation of community life. The character of the discipline and its administration may be wise or foolish, good or bad, depending on the character of those to whom it is entrusted.

A democracy must begin at the bottom if it expects to grow up. No country in the world ever had the opportunity to do that with better success than the American Republic of North America.

True, there were difficulties while the first installments of European immigration were making an effort to adjust themselves to a way of life that was entirely new to them. Beliefs, traditions and superstitions which had the weight of centuries behind them, which wouldn't fit into the pattern of a New World democracy, are things that are deep-rooted in some people.

But when the "hangovers" of the past raise hell in a peaceful community between those who otherwise could live together as good

neighbors, some neutralizing agency should be applied in the way of education. Belief, says the psychoanalyst, can be a question of choice with the individual. If it is based on something flimsy in character as a superstition, the belief will be nothing but mere rubbish in the mind of a person intelligent enough to reason from cause to effect. Perhaps this is the reason why someone said in a less informed age than the present one that "a little learning is a dangerous thing."

A little learning, or much learning, was the highway to democracy. If such a highway was considered by some very nice people who brought with them to America the idea of an Old World caste as a part of their luggage and a social necessity, it would have been wise to have thrown it overboard in crossing the Atlantic. However, there is some historic evidence that at least a little undemocratic ideas got by the immigration officers and in spite of social efforts to dilute it or blend it with the ideas of a democracy on such a question, the caste that raises social barriers continues to hold to its rank of exclusiveness in most of our metropolitan centers.

The street mob that threatened the life of Horace Mann, who advocated the establish-

ment of a public school system at state expense for the universal education of the boys and girls of America, no doubt was inspired by people who still had a part of this caste idea in their systems. The school teacher of today will remember that that was as recent as one hundred years ago.

In a retrospective study of the period some historian of the future may note that there was an increasing demand, as the population of the country multiplied, for educational facilities which would reach out to every child of school age. Democracy, with its Bill of Rights, was beginning to speak for itself and demanded 100 per cent literacy for everyone who qualified for citizenship.

It is rather an anomalous thing in the life of a free people that the mother church of Christianity should look askance at such a program of popular education which had won the endorsement of four-fifths of the country's population.

It is not easy to reconcile a theory of democracy upheld by this church in America, where education is a first necessity, and the dark age policy of illiteracy and ignorance which was the prevailing condition in countries where

the religion of the people was dominated and under the control of this particular church.

We may take it for granted that the average American citizen, on the question of religion, is willing to leave the matter just where the Bill of Rights left it—with the individual and his God. Under such an arrangement, any group of citizens who wishes to organize a church for the spiritual welfare of its community shall have the protection of the Constitution for that right. Such an enterprise, with its social contacts and with wise leadership, can do its bit to break down racial hatreds, erase boundary lines and strengthen the bonds of unity that tie a nation together when it is threatened by a catastrophic war.

CHAPTER X

CONFORMITY TO TYPE

IT may be that when immigration from other parts of the world will have been barred from this country for a period of ten or twenty generations, the hitherto Irishman from Cork will have lost his brogue and will have acquired all of the earmarks of a native American. If this should happen it would be in conformity with that which happened to other races that changed their habitat from one part of the world to another. This is merely the slow process of the evolutionary reaction to a new and different way of life. However, I believe that it would take more than the influences of a changed environment to turn an Irishman from Dublin into an Englishman of Manchester or one of the latter into a German. This is a question in human biology which goes farther back than a few generations of the species.

Moreover, were we to go so far as to bring this subject of human biology into the laboratory of experimental science for study, our

very limited human knowledge would be apt to go astray in such an experiment when we questioned the wisdom behind the original plan of all created life on this earth.

In the one hundred and thirty-five million that make up the population of our country, we have the Irishman, the Englishman, the German and a score of other individuals that represent so many racial groups. Each individual is an interesting study for the psychoanalyst, and his particular race with perhaps ten thousand years of biologic growth and development behind it for a background, may also warrant some study. The Good Book says we are wonderfully and fearfully made and our family doctor encourages us to hold firmly to this belief.

Some time ago I listened to a talk over the radio by Robert Sherwood, the well known author, who said that he walked about in the woods for four hours every day, in order to keep mentally and physically fit for the work that he had in hand. Anyone whose life was tied to the paved streets of the big city, its endless traffic roar and its tainted air, can envy the priceless privilege of such a close communion with nature. There is knowledge to be found there at first hand provided one is

observing enough to see it. The scientist as well as the poetic genius went there for study and inspiration.

But while the peace and quiet of its solitude is restful to the tired brain, there is something more than a casual interest for one who enters this sanctuary of Mother Nature, if he has eyes to see and ears to hear. The unending evolution of life, growth, decay and death is there as an open textbook for research and experiment. One who enjoys this sort of past-time has the choice as to how he should make use of it. He could either turn to a study of the tree life in his immediate surroundings or follow the example of Alice in Wonderland by going to sleep beneath one of the trees and in a dream get on speaking terms with a few of them as Alice succeeded in doing with a few of the mammals in the animal kingdom.

The virgin forests of this North American continent, when it flourished in all of its primeval beauty and splendor, were really a wonderland to all lovers of nature. But three centuries of the destructive forces of human habitation left little but remnants of the original vast acreage, and that only after the government took action to prevent its total destruction.

Most of us get our knowledge from the school of experience. We learn the value of things usually after we have lost them. The government survey of the land before it could be occupied down to the smallest unit of a forty-acre tract left it to the discretion of the settler as to how much of his claim he would reserve for a woodlot that would give him the needed supply for firewood and whatever lumber could be manufactured from it. Settlement of the land in this manner, instead of to large land-owners who would have little interest in a woodlot on each quarter section, no doubt left with us much of the standing timber or virgin forest which is not only a valuable asset to the individual owner but a wonderland of adventure and recreation for the children of the nation.

The continent as a whole, before it was settled by European immigration, was a paradise for the richest fauna of wild life ever discovered by a biological survey on any part of this earth's surface. Ninety-eight per cent of this wild life has been destroyed by the gunman in the short space of three centuries.

But here again we have to be more pragmatic than evangelistic. While the continent, before the advent of the white man on its

shores, had all of the elements for a perfect habitat for the life that existed on it then, it is needless to say that even any part of this life could continue as a next door neighbor to its greatest enemy.

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is a fine ideal to be kept in mind by the people of a democracy, but if this ideal has to be obtained at the cost of all of the other natural elements that are known to be contributing factors to it, the ideal will remain merely fine words in the preamble to a system of government.

Much of our thinking—when we think at all—is spent over causes which have a habit of reducing our dreams to that which Prospero called “the baseless fabric of a vision.” This may mean, in the life of some individuals, a complete change of viewpoint after the causes are studied and the effect comes home to roost.

The thinking mind, we take for granted, is an intelligent mind. If this is true it is a gift of God to the individual and should be jealously guarded when any kind of a social order seeks to make this gift the property of someone else.

If we are to make America the greatest

nation on earth, great enough to inspire other nations to follow its lead, it will be when all races on their own initiative show a disposition to conform to the cultural training of American institutions, make the English language the official language of all schools, and with a more perfect union, sing America loud enough for the rest of the world to hear it. Conformity to such a program should, after a while, give us the type of American we are looking for. At least the type of citizen who doesn't carry in his heart a divided loyalty for some other nationality.

The question of loyalty to America is something more than a matter of casual interest; it has been revealed that an oath of allegiance, like vaccination, is not always effective on the individual who swears to it and who happens to be a member of another race.

However, this is something which we may attribute to the more recent arrivals from the continent of Europe and a sidelight on the question which, let us hope, will in the passing of time fade out.

It is a very natural instinct to react to an impulse which may be the growth of many generations. There is nothing static in the biology of life on this earth. Change and

variety are two of its fundamental principles. Social contacts with the native population, the new environment and a different diet in cultural training will sometimes work miracles on the unspoiled child when he is left to his own initiative. Our difficulty with the "naturalized" immigrant arises when the latter ignores this kind of a program and persists in the perpetuation of one which was brought to America as a part of his European luggage.

There would be little to worry about on this phase of the question if the immigrant parents of native born children would agree to scrap any part of their European "culture" which they find to be inimical to the principles of our American democracy.

If this were done the native born child, with the help of the American public school, would not be likely to harbor the emotion of a divided loyalty. As a result of the reluctance of some immigrant parents to throw their beliefs and traditions out the window, even their native born children are questioned by our justice department to show cause why they should not be denaturalized.

When the world is at peace, especially the world of America¹, and people feel as free as the birds of the air, the question of loyalty to

one's country is not a burning question. In time of war it is tantamount to high treason.

When Theodore Roosevelt referred to the "hyphenated American" as a brand of immigrant who believed he was coming to live in a "polyglot boarding house," he evidently meant that the sole purpose in the mind of the immigrant when he moved from Europe to America was an economic one. But this statement was just a bit of plain talk by the former President, who had a habit of doing this when he wanted to reach the minds of the masses.

To be economically minded—to put this impulse above everything else—is an impulse which is included in the natural law of self-preservation. It is so fundamental a thing in all created life that the Founder of Christianity made it the fifth proposition in His prayer to Almighty God—"give us this day our daily bread." At this moment, where a large percentage of our immigrants came from, thousands are dying the terrible death of slow starvation. Destructive and prolonged wars can bring this condition about, as well as a catastrophic famine caused by the elements of nature over which we have no control.

Those people needed the freedom and liberty to plan their own way of life as expres-

sed so frequently by public opinion since this country entered the war. Most of all they desired freedom from want and FREEDOM FROM FEAR. Their coming to America to find it was the most natural instinct of the human mind. If they still find it difficult to learn the language of the new country, to part with traditions, superstitions and beliefs peculiar to their native lands, we can attribute it to that deep instinct that is too genetic in its nature to be cured in a day.

CHAPTER XI

DEMOCRACY A PLANT OF SLOW GROWTH

IT is difficult to think of a democracy, in the sense that we interpret the word here in America, without taking into consideration a number of things which have a direct effect on its growth and success. Many of us in a sort of way and without much knowledge of the facts, still regard the proposition of self-government dedicated by Lincoln at Gettysburg something to put into the hope chest for a future generation.

Much of this snail-like speed in the growth of the political structure is not so much due to slow thinking on the part of the individual as it is — I venture to say — to the stumbling blocks of a more or less serious character which are not things of native growth on American soil.

Democracy as a way of life, let me repeat, is the fulfillment of a mission which seeks to give the individual the largest freedom possible compatible with the social order of the

civilized state. That is, a chance to develop whatever talent or gifts that have been given to him by the grace of God.

The most important thing in the mind of this individual is the fact that he is here as one of millions of his kind and pledged to live on his good behavior under a government of law.

"While we are looking at the forest, we cannot see the trees," is an aphorism credited by newspaper men to the man now in the White House, whenever he attempts to drive home a point on a troublesome question.

In my time I have looked over the congregation of a church from the pulpit, over the audience from the stage of a theater and at a political gathering from all kinds of rostrums and must admit that I could see little or nothing of what was going on in the minds and hearts of the gathered individuals. The speaker could see his audience, but was unable to see the individual.

Yet the individual and his Bill of Rights are the things which must determine the greatest common measure or the least common multiple of a democracy which would like to call itself 100 per-cent American in its political, religious and social activities of every-day life. A self-governing democracy, like water, will

seek its level and this level will always be determined by the fitness of the average citizen to govern himself. How well he will fit into the pattern of our democracy will depend very largely on the type of culture or schools of thought which had the greatest influence on him.

Interest in such a responsibility among the great mass of the common people will rise or fall, depending on how well those who are entrusted with leadership will do the job. This, of course, is the test of any system of government. Much of the outside world is still skeptical of the American way set up a century and a half ago.

When the immigrants of the Old World, like Caesar, came and saw and conquered the wilderness of the North American continent, it was not necessary at the time to give much attention to the academic question of freedom and liberty.

This question had plenty of meaning in the world which the immigrant left behind him, but when he settled on his quarter section of land and built his log cabin in the new world, no doubt he ate his bread in the sweat of his face, but he had the God-given right to work out his own salvation as a free man.

A democracy, especially an American democracy, will not thrive in an atmosphere that is heavily charged with the voice of authority. The greater part of the historic record of western civilization is a record of physical and mental slavery in which the great mass of the common people bowed in obedience to the rule of some despot. When the intelligent and well informed individual is left to himself to think this over the most natural instinct of his soul is to rise up in revolt against it.

Perhaps one of the most promising things for the future of an American democracy was the fact that the immigrants who pioneered colonial America, or at least a large part of them, had this sort of a background in the old World.

How far the descendants of those immigrants of an earlier day in America have advanced towards a democracy in their way of thinking, is a question that requires some study. The descendants of more than one race apparently found it difficult to shake off a heritage of Old World culture which had become to them as deep-rooted as instinct in character.

No other people on earth that I can recall in the records of history were given the oppor-

tunity to build a democracy on a foundation of freedom as was given to the first settlers of early America. While the traditions of a monarchical system which encouraged the idea of "caste" in a social order still lingered in the minds of some of the races he was rare who would suggest the idea of the totalitarian state under some sort of a royal regime. It is true that there were those among the earlier generations in colonial history who were reluctant to cut the political ties which bound the colonies to the royal regime of the mother country; evidence of this came to the surface during the Revolution, and high treason on both sides of the question took its punishment by execution on the gallows.

There was evidence of some sentiment among the colonists of the first and second generations for royalty and its social caste system, but this sentiment, quite limited in scope, seemed to be more of a lack of faith in a theory of self-government, than any lingering love those self-thinking colonists may have had for a government of royal decrees. If there was any of it left after the Revolution it either died out for lack of stimulus or went back for a renewal of its faith in its native habitat. But as we look back one is

not sure that "we the people," up to the time of the Civil War and beyond it, had anything in the way of a government that even resembled a democracy.

The womanhood of the nation during all of this time had been denied the right of suffrage—for what reason, God only knows.

It is possible that in the writing of the Declaration of Independence Jefferson's mind may have been tainted with the classic idea of the dark ages that the "gentler sex" as a race of human beings was born inferior to her male companion.

I am not sure as to what was in the Jeffersonian mind when he laid down his "self-evident truths" as a premise to that to which he subscribed and pledged his "life, fortune and sacred honor." Had Jefferson's mind been as clear in its perspicacity on the subject of a real democracy as Lincoln's was four score years later, he might have rounded up at least one woman who would have subscribed her name to the Declaration and who also, no doubt, would have pledged her life, her fortune and her sacred honor.

There is an axiom in mathematics which says that the whole is greater than its parts. Lincoln applied this in his well known refer-

ence to the question of fooling the people.

If the phrase, "a self-governing democracy," has any truth in it, it must include all of the people—not just a part of them.

But it took about two centuries for the people of the United States to wake up to this fact. And now we wonder why it was not included in the Bill of Rights.

The cradle of democracy is in the nursery. The faith, hopes and inspiration imparted to the bit of humanity that lies in that cradle comes from the mother who bends over it with loving care — not the father. This is something which cannot be overlooked when self-government becomes a question for serious study. A prelate of the oldest Christian church was heard to remark in a lecture once, "Give us the child for our direction to the end of his seventh year, and we don't care who gets him after that."

This is something which may or may not be a fortunate thing for the child. It takes a strong type of individualism in the more mature life of the adult to break down the child psychology implanted in the awakening mind by the nursery and the elementary school. No one is more aware of this than the priesthood of the Greek and Latin

churches of the Christian religion.

Owing to the uncompromising attitude of these two divisions of Christianity we call Protestant and Catholic over a religious question which appears to the informed layman to be a question that is purely a matter of opinion and theological in character, it became necessary to ban all teaching of religion in our public schools.

When we speak of freedom of conscience for the individual in our American democracy, this inalienable right, let us hope, extends to the divine relationship between the individual and his God.

A democracy is never qualified for self-government until the great mass of the common people have been given some inspiration or encouragement to work out for themselves a solution of the problems such an undertaking involves. If the average mind of the common man is awakened to that it will get its first lesson for the awakening in the classroom and on the playground of the public school.

Religious intolerance, racial hatreds and social distinctions between the children of poverty and wealth are idiosyncracies of the mind that are not noticeable in this wonder-

land of American childhood. If we are to look for the coming American who will have the earmarks of American nativity we are apt to find one whose prejudices and hatreds for his fellow citizen were toned down on the playground of the public school. Sometimes it took an occasional bloody nose to accomplish this.

CHAPTER XII

THE CHURCH AND DEMOCRACY

ANYONE who attempts to define the "American" as a new type in race development must keep in mind that he is a normal human being with normal intelligence and inclined to be pragmatic in his reasoning when he expresses his opinion.

When such an individual stands on his own feet, or as the poet would put it, is "captain of his own soul," capable of self-government, he is in a position to defend his Bill of Rights.

But in our American democracy, or any other democracy for that matter, quite a large percentage of the population does not rise to this level.

That is our problem. But it has been the problem of humanity throughout the ages, and no doubt will continue to be a problem so long as the motherhood of a nation continues to give birth to the imbecile as often as the genius, and while the shrub in the forest will grow up from the same soil as the magnificent tree.

We accept these very patent truths of biology in plant and animal life in the casual manner that we accept the sunlight, the air we breathe and other gifts of nature that make life on this planet a possibility and conscious of our helplessness that we can do nothing about it. In a democracy, we are forever coming back to the individual to ask him, how are you behaving yourself? The life or death of a self-governing democracy is wholly dependent on the character of the answer this individual has to give.

We like to refer to him as "the man in the street," a man who has lost the earmarks of any particular racial group. If he is of British ancestry, he will speak good English with a Webster diacritical accent. Like the average individual of the north temperate zone, his physical stature will be of medium height, he will weigh about 155 pounds and have a fondness for outdoor sports.

If he has had a few generations of self-government and good behavior behind his American ancestry as a source of inspiration, he has the right to enjoy a freedom that is as natural to him as the air he breathes. This was in the original blueprint which gave him his inalienable rights, and if he is the normal

type we have just described, he will come very close to the type of citizen commonly recognized as "the American."

It is needless to add that the woman who is mated to this man in wedlock, if good biology for the following generation is considered, must be his equal in physical and mental development. The percentage of these normal people in the population in any one generation is likely to determine the life or death of our democracy.

They are the human material—the very life-blood—that can keep such a political structure on its feet as a going concern. When more than one half of the population of any country falls below this level physically and mentally—especially the latter—it has qualified itself for the totalitarian state and the mailed fist of the dictator. Oh yes, it can happen here.

The rise and fall of nations and the overthrow of governments has been the principal topic of the historian for the past 5000 years. America has laid a good foundation. If it keeps fully awake to this important fact, the downfall, more than once predicted, may not come for some time.

But whether a nation lives for a long or

a short period of time in this western civilization of ours is a matter which depends very much on how well that nation has succeeded in keeping its people happy and contented with their lot.

If this freedom of the individual, referred to so often, is as free as the air he breathes, the responsibility of the things pertaining to his everyday life would be left entirely to his own initiative. This, of course, would be taking it for granted that we have reached some degree of homogeneity in our population and that at least a majority of our people had sense enough to come in out of the rain.

"All men are created equal," says the Declaration. All men are not created equal, say the physiologist and the psychoanalyst. Moreover, the forest ranger and writer of books whom we have referred to agrees with the two scientists, that the trees which he observes as he strolls about among them, are not equal.

There are some facts of a scientific character in connection with this matter which bring the subject of all created life, plant and animal, into the same laboratory for research and study. In this research and study, I submit that in my own lifetime there has been a complete reversal in the teaching which

was handed to him in his childhood and that which is offered today to the childhood of America. This, we hope, is progress in the right direction and we would offer no criticism until we were sure it was constructive and to the point.

If one third of all created life is destined to fall by the wayside and perish, any curator of natural science who is informed on the subject will tell you that it is a better showing for old Mother Earth than she made even as late as a few centuries ago.

In this most favored part of America for the genesis of a strong and virile race of people, the span of life has been extended to almost the length of the span of a generation a few centuries ago. This may be attributed to better and more sanitary homes, healthier habits of living and a purer and more wholesome food supply. This was brought about by the American idea of universal education for the great mass of the common people, the daily newspaper and in recent years that miracle of marvels which has brought the whole world within calling distance — the radio.

With these cultural advantages, coupled with a normal level of intelligence inherited

by the great mass of the common people from previous generations, a prosperous and smooth-running American democracy would come very close to being an accomplishment. However, there is still some evidence not only among our racial groups but in the teaching of our cultural institutions, that we are yet some distance from that goal. The "meltingpot" is rusting on the scrap-heap of good intentions and the spiritual influence of the Christian religion, instead of being what its Founder intended it to be, may easily be credited with the slowing down of the "more perfect union" of our democracy.

During the centuries of western civilization the historic record of the Christian era furnishes plenty of evidence to the reader what the church, for the greater part of its long history, had done to inspire the great mass of the common people to prepare itself for anything which would resemble in any manner a self-governing democracy.

It took the free, untrammelled mind of a native American to write a Declaration of Independence for his people. He knew that he could make that Declaration stick, for most of his fellow countrymen, like himself,

had grown to the stature of free men and were doing their own thinking.

Shakespeare makes his character, Julius Caesar, say, "Such men are dangerous." Yes, dangerous, in the past, to some of the rulers who sat on a throne, and in our modern world, to the dictator who has formed the habit of using the firing squad.

As we have already observed, some form of a social order for community life in the civilized state must be adhered to or we will have nothing but a reign of anarchy. The cure for the latter condition, if it could happen in a democracy, is a system of universal education which would reach out to all the people—not just a part of them—under state control.

To allow this educational system to be divided on racial or religious lines in the interest of some particular group would mean, if it means anything, a divided democracy. It will be said, of course, that the question is purely an academic one, which in practice will have no effect whatever on the unity of our democracy as a whole.

The average American, inclined to be indifferent and liberal-minded on the question, may agree with this viewpoint, he may even

be willing to vote for an educational system which would make a particular brand of religious faith a dominant factor in its teaching. It is possible that there is quite a large percentage of native Americans who takes its Bill of Rights more seriously than its prayers.

Freedom of worship to many of these Americans may mean just what the text of the Bill of Rights intended to convey to a God-fearing or God-loving individual. This right has never been amended and we cannot by any flight of the imagination see the church or the religious organization that would offer to circulate a petition for such an amendment. If there is such a thing as divine inspiration on earth, those responsible for this particular freedom being made a provision in our Bill of Rights when the Constitution was written must have had it. Or it could be that inspiration that comes to the mind at rare moments and which throws a clear light on our difficult problems, problems which must be settled correctly, or not at all.

Washington, Franklin and Jefferson may not have been inspired as an ancient Israelite was inspired when he wrote the Ten

Commandments, but they inspired and ordered written a code of laws just as basic for the social order of a democracy.

CHAPTER XIII

MENTAL SCRAP

LET me quote again the noted psychologist to the effect that the "greatest thing in the universe is Man and that the greatest thing in Man is mind." This at least is the concept of a creature that thinks and reasons for itself; while he walks the earth with his chin up and really believes he is the only pebble on the beach. From a cosmic viewpoint one must admit that he is quite justified in this, for when his little span of life is ended, so far as he is concerned, the universe with its starry heavens of other suns and other worlds becomes a total blackout.

In a physical sense that is the end of the story—the dust and ashes of something that had served its time.

The development of the mental and spiritual mind of man, which enabled him to see the possibilities in a way of life that was above and beyond the primary wants of mere animal instinct, was an awakening which brought to him much of those blessings which he now enjoys in the civilized state.

Any progress we make in America in the way of improvement on past civilizations will depend very largely on the character of the cultural training we have to offer to the common people which in the past was not always extended to the part of the population.

The phrase, "cultural training," has an academic smack to it, which may mean a whole lot to some individuals and very little to others. No one knows this better than the college professor in charge of students who are trying for an academic degree in some course of study, with a prospect of fifty per cent of those young hopefuls falling by the wayside in the final test.

Even after that precious piece of parchment has been handed to them quite a number will fail to make good in their chosen professions. At the moment there seems to be some opinion that is gaining ground among the school men and women of the nation which advocates some adjustment or necessary changes in the curriculum.

This student body, we must keep in mind, is a small but important segment of our democracy—important, because it is that part of our citizenship which the nation as a whole must look to for wise and qualified leader-

ship. Whenever one sees the framed certificate of an academic degree hung up in the office of one of these graduates, its appraised value will level up or level down, depending on how well the skill and knowledge acquired by its owner fitted into the community life of our democracy.

If this cultural training happens to be of a kind that will not stand on its own feet as a basic factor in the every-day life of the common people, it would be only a question of time until it went to the scrap-heap of obsolete and discarded experiments. This would be not only democracy in action, it would be the progress of a free people who had learned to do its own thinking.

We have heard it said that there is nothing static in the universe. From an astro viewpoint, this small planet spinning around on its orbit at a safe distance from a blazing sun, may not look big to the astronomer on his map of the starry heavens or in the cosmic ocean of space. But as a part of a solar system—as a part of the universe—it is extremely important in the sense that it has created life on its surface.

As a part of this life, the homo sapien—modern man—is anything but static physically

and mentally—especially the latter in his movements. There is also a saying that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Political science put to work in our democracy will be just as strong as this weakest link—no stronger—and this in turn will depend on how well the leadership entrusted with a government can guard the rights of the individual citizen.

The life, growth, decay and death of a nation may have its parallel with that of any other living thing and death in some form is bound to overtake it sooner or later—at least that seems to be the record of the civilized state.

The political leader who makes our American democracy the subject of a public address sometimes refer to the century and a half of its life and growth, but this is only a brief period in the history of western civilization and certainly not long enough to develop a distinct racial group which could be characterized as American and 100 per cent homogeneous.

“Rome was not built in a day,” is a platitude that is worn threadbare in literary usage, but out of the melting-pot or out of the

witch's caldron the American racial group will come in the fulness of time.

But there is no magic—black or white—in the operation of natural law. We shall have to leave this to the tricks of the stage magician or the witch-doctor of the jungle.

The evolution of life on this earth is a slow process and the process is a profound mystery—even to the man of science, baffled in his efforts to trace the origin of the life principle in a living cell. The theology of religion has a ready answer for the question, but the answer from this viewpoint is based entirely on belief and faith. Unfortunately for the spiritually inclined members of our race, the organized church succeeded in making the question an extremely controversial one, and before the advent of the printing press and secular as well as religious education for the masses of the common people, it was frequently a primary cause of some of our most disastrous wars.

The peoples of every nation in continental Europe who have formed the habit of reading history for pastime and are blessed with a memory, are aware of this. Moreover, all of those nations have paid the price for that which appears to us at this distance to be

non-essential and hatred-breeding -religious controversies.

The historian of early America has it on record that some of this theological scrap of European vintage was brought over by the first generation of immigrants and for a time showed some signs of growth, especially among those immigrants who settled in the New England states. But by the time the Constitution was written its framers believed it wise to leave the question of religion completely out of the political structure of the nation.

We doubt if there is a statesman in America, worthy to be designated as such, who would question the wisdom of that decision.

Under this arrangement the organized church, like the individual, was given its Bill of Rights, and while it lives within the spirit of the Constitution, those rights, like the rights of the individual, shall never be repealed or abridged by an act of Congress.

What is the result? The church is at peace in America, and while at present it has a backward look in its theology and is more or less static in its articles of faith, this may be merely a question of church government and

has little to do with the real mission of Christianity and its basic meaning in the spiritual life of the common people who look to the church for leadership.

Human nature being what it is, there is a moral responsibility resting on the shoulders of any government which overlooks or neglects a cultural agency that seeks to awaken in the mind of the individual citizen something finer than mere animal instinct.

This is something more basic in substance than the minerun of church theology. It is that which inspired Phidias to carve the Athenian marble into a thing of beauty, Rapheal to put life into a picture and make it a masterpiece, and a Lincoln speech at Gettysburg to arouse the democracies of the world to a sense of freedom and their divine right for self-government.

There is a sphere of influence in this for the American church, provided its religious philosophy is trimmed to the pattern of our American Bill of Rights.

I believe that had the church pursued such a policy during the centuries of its existence on the continent of Europe its long suffering people might have had a different story to tell to the rest of the world.

The Christian religion was one of the finest things ever given to mankind to help turn life on this old earth into a paradise.

If its mission failed in that part of the world where it was founded, the failure can be attributed to a human civilization whose cultural training is not even skin-deep.

The stark nakedness of this truth is so self-evident on the continent of Europe at this moment that it requires no comment.

There is a cause for everything that happens to human civilization on this earth and this cause, when it turns out to be disastrous, can be traced to the frailties of human behavior.

The self-governing individual who is proud to be called an American should remember to keep in mind—especially if he happens to be native born—that his ancestors, no doubt, had the same desire in their hearts for freedom and self-government running back perhaps for a thousand generations, but had been denied those inalienable rights by a tyranny of overlordship which kept the great mass of them in a state of mental slavery.

Mental slavery has been in the past and can be in the future of our race the heaviest curse handed down to a benighted people—

a people too credulous to suspect and too willing to believe in the honesty of the motive that inspired this brand of slavery.

Any political or religious system that would encourage such a program for the sake of discipline in a social order is a misfit in an informed democracy.

CHAPTER XIV

CIVILIZATION AND "ISMS"

IT is evidently true that there are more "isms" in the cultural life of the people of this American continent today than ever existed before in any period of its history.

Many of these "isms" are offshoots from a mother plant—a plant which in some cases has the weight of centuries behind it to give it the constitutional right of free speech.

Religion, owing to its mystical character, comes in for a large part of the "isms" and each one is a potential powderkeg for the dialectitians of religious controversy.

Perhaps this is not to be wondered at, for there was a time not so very long ago in the life of our ancestry when those acrimonious debates on the subject of religion was a burning question to a lot of serious minded people. It would likely be a wrong guess on the part of anyone to say that the average intelligence of our American progenitors of the 16th century was on a lower level than that of their descendants of the present day.

From the viewpoint of the anthropologist this curator of natural science is of the opinion that man's intelligence was on as high a level of development ten thousand years ago as it is today. If he seemed to have made slow progress in putting this intelligence to the best use in his climb to a higher level than the ape of the jungle, the slowness could probably be charged to an environment and to habits of life which were the lot of the masses for the greater part of this long period.

There could not have been much opportunity for the awakening of the common man while tribal government was a government of master and slave, and learning under the censorship of leaders who looked upon it as a dangerous thing to obedience and authority.

If there has been one stumbling block greater than another in the pathway to progress, one sees it in this enslavement of the human mind by a leadership that feared it as it would a sleeping monster. One of the strongest passions in the hearts of the human individual is the ambition to rule others. When there is meek obedience on the part of the slave who gets down on his knees in the dust to this type of ambition, the tribal chief—

if we can translate him—calls it a cardinal virtue.

But this cardinal virtue, while it is essential to a well organized social order, can be as deadly to the immature and adolescent mind under unwise discipline as a black frost can be to the tender growth coming to maturity in a spring garden.

Unwise teaching for the younger generation in religious and secular training, in which a knowledge of the facts and a question of truth are involved, sometimes will have a reaction that turns out to be embarrassing to the teacher. However, this teaching, wise or unwise, is the record of all learning.

Moreover, it is the soil from which sprouts the "isms" of our civilization.

One who would undertake to write a history of these "isms" would have something in the way of material which goes back to the beginning of the organized state. They are a product of the thinking man of every socialized community and when the latter is expanded to the boundaries of a nation, any one of them—depending on its character—can become a part of the cultural training of the whole people.

Christianity as a concept of religious faith

was relentlessly persecuted as an "ism" during the first three centuries of its history, until one of the last rulers of the decaying Roman Empire took cognizance of the persecution as a destructive agency and gave this religious "ism" the protection of the Roman law. The Founder of this great religion, like Socrates, left no books. But He apparently left a message with His disciples that required no written record. It was a message which involved the moral and spiritual behavior of man on this earth and was already written by the finger of God on the heart of every spiritually minded man and woman fortunate enough to be born with a spiritual soul. At any rate, the fundamental truth at the bottom of this particular "ism" is what gives it immortality among the more decadent things in human life.

Any political structure, social order or academic system which has ambition enough to live and become a part of the national life of the people, must necessarily have something akin to the elements of immortality in its system if it expects to live.

If these elements are lacking the political or social experiment, or whatever it happens

to be, will have its day in court, then fade out or be crushed under the wheels of progress.

If we are looking for the best development of the individual, and this seems to be the aim of democracy, no philosophic theory of government has ever been offered to a people that could successfully replace such a system. The thinking minds of America are awake to this and look with suspicion on any "ism" that is out of step with this American way of life. This way of life received its inspiration very largely from blood-bespattered civilizations which have gone before and are wary of any "ism" which believes it has something better to offer.

We cannot repeat too often, if we hope to drive the fact home to the mass of our people, that our written Constitution, with its Bill of Rights, still stands as a challenge to the other governments of the world to build a better political structure for their people.

Socialism, fascism and communism are theories of government which came to life on the continent of Europe within the last half century and are schools of thought dealing with questions which seem to appeal to a type of mind, often quite radical in its thinking, which sees nothing good in a conservatism

which blocks the way to a tryout of their political and economic theories.

When these "isms" are reduced to the fineness of dialectics in argument, or to a purely academic state, so far as their practicability is concerned, interest in them will be limited to a type of mind which has a penchant for the opposition on all questions.

At the moment one of the most learned men on political science in the nation and an advocate of socialism for the best part of his life has been the head and front of the socialist party for more than two decades, but the likelihood of his reaching the White House as President still remains, for the time being, a mere spec of hope. To transplant a political philosophy of European vintage to the soil of America, with the hope that there are enough dissatisfied citizens to "fall for it," is merely the dream of someone who either has still much to learn about American democracy, or who has not yet grown up to the maturity of an American.

I am not for one moment hinting that the head of the socialist party is that type of an American. If an academic knowledge of political science and of the things that make a government of the people, by the people

and for the people a reality in the conduct of American politics were the only requirements, Norman Thomas could easily reach the White House at the head of any party. To avoid a mis-translation by the reader of this panegyric boost to the scholarly gentleman referred to, I must add that he has been on record for forty years or more as a Republican—not a Socialist.

Fascism is apparently another exegesis of Carl Marx socialism with the present dictator of Italy its most ardent exponent. This "ism" differs somewhat from the popular meaning given to the word "socialism" by the man in the street in the sense that it includes religion as a part of its program.

As a form of government for the people of Italy, for instance, one may be excused if he doubts the sincerity of this pious gesture coming from a dictator. However, in this case, the Vatican was a next door neighbor and there may have been a hint to the dictator that the Holy Father still had some influence over the religious thought of the Italian people.

We do not raise the question as to how well this form of socialism would suit the fancy of a people willing to submit to the rule

of a totalitarian state, but we do know, if we know anything of our American, that it would never fit into the pattern of our American democracy.

Communism perhaps could be defined as the radical left wing of socialism. Our lexicographers give a more comprehensive meaning than that. In fact they give several meanings to the word. Funk and Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary gives three, each defining this proposed theory of government when put into practice, depending on the plan adopted by its advocates.

The flexibility in meaning of the word may range all the way from the Christian ideal of community life expressed in the Sermon on the Mount to the atheism and anarchy in government which followed the French Revolution in France in 1789.

The quality of conservatism or liberalism in the political structure of any civilized state can usually be measured by the per cent of literacy or illiteracy that exists among the common people.

The qualifications for self-government must begin with the individual but before the individual can take the first step in this direc-

tion he must be taught to do some thinking for himself.

He is not likely to do this if he doesn't even know the alphabet of his mother tongue. There was a time in the history of some of our American ancestors when it was a crime even to learn the alphabet. Mental slavery and meek obedience to the "divine authority" of both church and state were the best qualifications at that time for good citizenship.

Any normal, intelligent grown-up will think twice before he will destroy a child's belief in a well-told fairy tale. A lively imagination in a child is a gift of Nature and when it goes hand in hand with a high degree of intelligence, it can, like necessity, be the mother of invention.

But there are beliefs still extant in our western civilization, handed down to us from the past as a sort of inheritance, which were never intended to play the role of a fairy tale, yet put the story or teaching into cold print and that would be the translation any intelligent student of English would likely give to it.

A lot of this scrap material, which in its time may have been the best in the way of cultural training, is now the folk lore which may be cherished and retained in the memory

of some of our people and completely discarded by others. This, of course, will depend very largely on the dissemination of knowledge and the character of the secular and religious education of the church and school. Racial differences and a divided public opinion on this have always been breeders of "isms" and unending controversy.

CHAPTER XV

"BLOOD IS THICKER THAN WATER"

THE heading of this chapter is not a Biblical proverb. The informed man in the street will remember that the words were uttered by the commanding officer on a gunboat of our naval service and which at the time—more than a half-century ago—was patrolling one of the navigable rivers of the Asiatic continent.

It is one of those utterances frequently heard in our everyday speech and sometimes quoted by one who knows nothing of the circumstances regarding its origin. On this particular occasion the question of racial prejudice was raised when our American naval officer saw that the crew of a British gunboat on the same patrol duty were attacked by an overwhelming number of natives who evidently had determined to slaughter the Britishers to the last man. Our naval officer, disregarding a rule of international law, came to his brother white-man's rescue by turning his guns on the natives who happened to have yellow skins.

Our commander's comment, as we have noted, for his part in that naval scrap in the far East years ago, was, "Blood is thicker than water." Taken literally, this phrase doesn't make sense standing alone, but we have many such phrases in our English language which become as convenient as a Biblical proverb in emphasizing a point after much use in speaking and writing.

In our effort to answer the question, "Who are the Americans?" we no doubt went far afield at times for a more intimate viewpoint than we could get from the dry pages of history.

One is more apt to find a paved highway to the storehouse of knowledge in the living present than a lost trail in the wilderness of a dead past. It is the difference between realism and fancy—between truth and the fairy tale.

The naval officer on the gunboat was in the living present at the time. He expressed his true feelings on what was happening to the British officer on the other gunboat, no doubt, when he made his comment. He was intensely human when he did this, that is, he was true to the instincts of the human race the world over. The white-skinned English-

man was nearer to him in world brotherhood than the yellow-skinned Asiatic. At the moment we are at war with one group of this great Asiatic race, and certain traits of character in this group have come to the surface as the war goes on which are apt to leave a racial hatred on the part of Americans tending to out-hate anything ever felt for a racial group on the continent of Europe.

We have a few members in our population of this Asiatic group, most of them on our west coast. If they remain to themselves without intermarriage with any other race they are likely to remain to the end of time a Mongolian group of yellow-skinned Americans.

The sociologist who speaks for the whole human race—for "the federation of the world and a parliament of man," will see nothing wrong with this. Nevertheless, there is enough wrong with it to stay, for a while at least, this realization of the poet's dream.

But while the prospect of world brotherhood seems to be rather remote at the present moment, there is some evidence of a political and Christian unity in our English-speaking American which has at least made a start in that direction.

This may be owing to the fact that the people of the North American continent, from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Circle, with the exception of one or two racial groups, speak the same language and manage to make their variety of viewpoints primary lessons in American citizenship.

Those lessons were not easy for one tied down to the traditions and beliefs deep-rooted in the past. The fight for freedom in the early life of a democracy on this continent, whether in the United States or across the border in Canada, was sometimes on the part of some race, a fight in defense of these traditions and beliefs.

The infant democracy at this period, while it was receiving spankings from its mother-England, perhaps for its rebellious behavior, was having troubles of its own nearer home—troubles which in some instances were volcanic in their reactions against any radical change in the status quo of former habits of life peculiar to certain racial groups in the population.

In the early part of our history, especially that part we refer to as the colonial period, it was no easy task for those agencies responsible for our American civilization to tone

down this attitude to a level of tolerance and the Christian spirit so it would work successfully in an American democracy.

Let us admit that there are racial elements in the mythical melting-pot which wouldn't blend into something else in a thousand generations. But this is no reason why they could not receive a cultural training which would make such elements fit perfectly into the pattern of a democracy.

The American negro, who has increased to quite a large group in our population, stands out quite conspicuously in this respect, not on account of any flaw which might be found in his qualifications for citizenship, but purely on the question of "social equality" with his white-skinned brother.

Any reference made to this race should be more illuminating and comprehensive than the brief mention made to the subject here. If the Negroes are not all Americans in the current meaning of our language, what are they?

It took four years of a fratricidal war and almost a break-up of the Union to wipe the stain of human slavery from the map of America, and as we look back over the record of that moral blunder in our history one won-

ders how some of our best people could reconcile the institution of human slavery with a theory of government which provided in its written Constitution that all men were free and equal. This attitude raised the question at the time—was the American negro a human being?

This dark colored race, which has increased to twelve or thirteen millions in our population, has more than one redeeming quality to its credit as citizens. When this right was extended to it there were those who raised objections. However, any intelligent observer who has given the matter any study and who knows something about this race, will not go out of his way to deny any of those redeeming qualities. There are of course some people among the other groups of our population who see little virtue underneath the dark colored skin of the American Negro, nevertheless it is there, although perhaps not evident to one blinded by a racial hatred which was handed down to him as a heritage from the past.

There is a philosophy of life, based on a keen sense of humor, which I noted during the seventeen years I spent below the "Mason and Dixon line" that was evident in the everyday life of these descendants of former slaves.

Mirth and laughter are nearer the surface of the skin—sometimes under the most trying mental and physical conditions, than are evident among the members of any other race in our population. There are some serious minded folks among us who wouldn't list this sense of humor in a race of people among the cardinal virtues, but in a mad world like the present there would seem to be a place for it.

Let it stand as an aphorism in our speech that "blood is thicker than water," when we speak of the races that make up the world's population. But what we are mostly interested in is the measure of thickness we have in the bloodstreams of two score or more races in the present population of America which still can be identified even after more than one generation of American nativity, either by the outlines of physical stature, habits of life or accent in speech.

Each of these groups, studied separately from the viewpoint of its qualifications to fit into the pattern of an American democracy, would very likely reveal more than one misfit.

The late President Eliot of Harvard University was credited with a statement made in one of his lectures years ago on this subject to the effect that we would never be able to make

an American out of an Irishman. This perhaps was too pessimistic a view yet where will you find the Irishman who is not always ready to put emphasis on his hyphenated citizenship when any reference is made to this question?

I might add that there are several other groups whose numbers run into the millions who are reluctant to put aside their traditional beliefs and the spoken language of their former European habitat—habits which leave them more or less isolated as citizens among the rest of the population. Granted that those are rights under the Constitution which everyone of these groups has a right to enjoy, yet do they not run counter to the American way of life?

It is pertinent to the point to ask whether our liberalism towards a racial group that desires to live its own way of life is in conflict with the American way or not, a brand of liberalism which is at present working out successfully in every-day practice.

We believe that our American democracy with its Bill of Rights for the individual will come nearer doing this than any other nation on earth.

Human nature was here on earth long before there was any attempt at any kind of a

social order. It is apt to strike back blindly at anything that it mistrusts — sometimes at something in which it has no faith. Much of the racial hatred in the world today can be attributed to the untutored mind of a backward race of people—a condition that is responsible for much of the blood that is spilled on a battlefield.

If the first aim of our American democracy is to insure domestic peace within our own borders, every individual and racial group that came here from the Old World to enjoy our freedom and liberty should be charged with the responsibility of helping to insure this peace. If they have come here for economic reasons only they do not fit into the picture.

CHAPTER XVI

"AS A MAN THINKETH, SO HE IS"

THIS proverb from the Bible, like many others in that storehouse of moral and spiritual truths, we sometimes hear quoted by an individual who may not realize that his thinking is the material he puts into the building of a character which later on will be his real personality.

In the freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of worship which we enjoy so much in our American democracy, we are prone to be tolerant with any institution — whether that institution be political, religious or social in its activities — which for some selfish interest for its own advancement would not hesitate to sway the thinking mind of its devotees away from their constitutional rights, if any one of these activities thought the trick could be turned without noticeable publicity.

All of these cultural institutions are products of the human mind. To a very large extent, they are built—even here in America—on the dust and ashes of past civilizations.

There is nothing miraculous about them in the current meaning of that word. The political, religious and social structure of each one of them is as good or as bad as the ingenuity or frailties of man at his best and his worst could make it.

In any organized unit of activity, regardless of its nature, we cannot repeat too often that the individual can never expect to have 100 per cent freedom to do as he pleases. Neither has any organized unit of a social order the right to reduce this freedom to a point where the individual's initiative to do its own thinking becomes the delusion of the simpleton. This, as Ralph Waldo Emerson put it, is nothing less than mental suicide for the individual.

In free America, any school of thought with its thinking still rooted in the cultural training of European institutions, is very apt to meet with vigorous opposition when it puts forward its claims for endorsement. Most of the "isms" which cropped to the surface in America since the birth of the nation and which were given their day in court, more often than not, were concepts of European origin.

The warning to the free people of America at the beginning of its life among nations of

the world was given to them by the failure of this brand of cultural training to take into account the ever threatening danger of a revolt against it of the masses of the common people by those who usurped all authority to rule. The anomalous thing in this situation exposed by the record of the historian is what happened on the European continent to the Christian ideal of religion. The states which held out against the ratification of the Constitution for months after it was adopted by the convention were those that insisted that a Bill of Rights be added for the protection of the freedom of the individual as a free American.

It may be noted here with some interest that two of the older states of the confederation of colonies—Virginia and Massachusetts—whose citizens, at the time the Constitution was sent back to the people of the states for ratification, were very largely of British descent, were the states most insistent for the added ten amendments. Moreover, it is significant to note that those early Americans of British descent were wide awake to the possibility of trouble with some questions of state and church which their ancestors in the mother country had had some difficulty with.

during a considerable part of the preceding century.

Those ancestors went through a political Revolution and a religious Reformation which made that century the most historic in the annals of the British monarchy.

Perhaps, having this in mind, some member from Massachusetts or Virginia submitted the first Amendment, which read:—

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibit the exercise thereof.”

This was the dictum of a free people in a free land to both church and state to keep hands off a question which concerned only the individual and the God he chose to worship.

Of course this doesn't mean that the state and the church in a country with as much freedom for the individual as the people of America enjoy, were denied any rights under the Constitution which might have a well ordered society and the right spirit for a community interest. As Americans, we may be more keenly conscious of the political and religious tyranny than other groups of the world's population that have not yet learned the meaning of freedom and liberty for the individual.

A thinking mind is usually an intelligent mind and if given enough freedom to do its thinking it may become the spark-plug which will wake up the cells of a sleeping brain.

Any observing student who "burned the midnight oil" wrestling with a difficult problem in mathematics, but gave it up when the clock struck two and restful sleep was making its demands, had the solution come to him after he woke up without effort and the intellectual cells had had a respite from over-fatigue.

Academic training for itself alone and with a well balanced outline of subject matter for a normal intelligent mind will do what the athletic field will do for the athlete.

This is the only thing that will put the heartbeats into a democracy and a democracy will mean little anywhere if it doesn't have this kind of training. No people on earth are as much alive to this fact as the freedom-loving people of the Western Hemisphere — North and South. It would be a racial catastrophe of the greatest magnitude if this freedom, so dearly bought on all the battlefields of the world, were lost again and we went back to the dark ages of master and slave.

It is a freedom which could easily be lost

in a world upheaval like the present one and which might not be recovered again in generations, or until the system responsible for the change had been weighed in the balance and found to be scrap material of a social order which had its birth in the brain of a madman.

When this sort of madness develops into a school of thought and strikes the fancy of a certain type of mind, it might prove to be as dangerous to the peace of the world as a forest fire would be to a stand of valuable timber.

It is a madness that engulfs and swallows all saner opposition — that feeds upon itself until the venom created by such a diet grows deadly enough to destroy it. But this, as we have noted, has been the record of western civilization and what America as a new racial group in the world's population is trying to do is to point out, if it can, that which it believes to be a political, religious and economic way of life which may help to avoid some of the mistakes of its ancestry in other lands.

It cannot be denied that we have made some progress in this direction. Many of the things peculiar to the political, religious and economic way of life in the early history of our democracy, and which as we have noted were just parts of the luggage that came in with our

immigration, have now faded from the record. Most of the freedoms proclaimed by law for the individual are now actual truths in his everyday life.

Perhaps we might offer just one exception to this—even when we realize that the viewpoint of any lay writer, regardless of the subject chosen for discussion, may be looked upon as that of the “infidel dog” who dares to trespass on “Holy ground.”

Be that as it may, I happen to be a native American who took the written word of the Constitution at its face value and who managed to keep his religious views strictly between himself and his God.

In trying to think clearly on this phase of thought we call religion I have looked over some definition of the word given by one of the latest compiled unabridged dictionaries, and somewhat to our confusion, read the following, which was the first given of several definitions:

“Religion:—A belief in a superhuman power, conceived after the analogy of the human spirit on which man regards himself dependent and to which he thinks himself to some degree responsible, to-

gether with the feeling and practices which might flow from such a belief."

The lexicographer no doubt intended this to cover any school of religious thought which made mysticism the primary element in its belief. From a layman's viewpoint this is an attempt to define the undefinable, hence an unending controversy arising from that which seems to be a dislocated teaching in cultural training which divides the realm of mysticism and faith from the world of materialism and scientific fact.

That first amendment to the Constitution gave the American church full freedom to pursue its own religious policy with all other free institutions enjoying the rights and legal protection of state and federal law. Under such auspices the American church—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish—has made religion an essential and important part of American civilization.

The controversies which cursed the religious life of the people of the Old World for generations were never given any encouragement under this plan of religious freedom.

However, I might mention that the Catholic Church has always looked askance, even here in America, at a liberalism more inclined to

look forward than backward in a world of action, and a liberalism which would be apt to question the infallibility of any teaching which had nothing more convincing than a venerable age and tradition for its claims. The attitude of this particular church may not have any reference whatever to a belief in God or a Supreme Being, but is more apt to be a question of church theology which is of interest only to those concerned with organized church government. It is the human side of the religious question which sometimes offers a brand of theology which is removed only about one step from the witchcraft of the jungle.

Perhaps it can be said with some truth that the great religious system of Christianity has suffered more from a backward looking theology than it ever suffered from disastrous wars between Christian nations.

When one looks at the causes which fired the spirit of revolution and the overthrow of a government in such countries as Mexico, Spain and Russia which were dominated by the ecclesiastical power of the catholic church previous to the outbreak of the revolution, one does not wonder at the rise to power of such

an impossible theory of government as Communism.

Why was illiteracy a notorious condition in those countries before the revolt of the common people came to ask that question?

When a government is overthrown by a revolution of its people, the revolutionists in setting up a new government are apt to go to extremes by getting as far away as possible from the causes which they believed were responsible for such a crisis.

The people behind the revolutions in the three countries we have just named no doubt were convinced that the church, exercising a powerful political as well as a religious influence over its people, could not have been totally blind to the conditions which prevailed under its rule, but whether this was true or not it very evidently failed to keep step with the progress of a moving world—not only standing as a barrier in some cases to this progress, but continuing to cling tenaciously to a medieval school of thinking outmoded in a modern world.

“As a man thinketh, so he is.” If there is any truth in this, it would seem to be one of the most important essentials in the cultural training of a people striving to reach a higher

level for the better things in life. A people cannot do this while it is under the domination of a rule which keeps it in blissful ignorance of the world it is now in.

To encourage such a program under the auspices of a Christian church was to encourage illiteracy and ignorance among the masses of the common people, this being the very antithesis of the requirements of an informed democracy and which is the highest aim of all free governments. Our good neighbor south of the border—Mexico—never enjoyed it until it threw off the yoke of Church rule, a medieval brand of Spanish origin tried out on a highly intelligent race of people that finally rose in revolt against it.

CHAPTER XVII

SECULAR EDUCATION AND THE CHURCH

WHEN God breathed a spiritual soul into the mind of animal man at some point, let us believe, away back on the evolutionary trail, the creature woke up to realize that he could distinguish the difference between good and evil, between right and wrong and with the faculties of reason and perspicacity already highly developed, let us assume, he took a long stride ahead of the rest of his fellow creatures of the animal kingdom.

When I make this statement a sort of premise to what follows, I am fully aware that we are in conflict with church authority on the subject whose orthodox teaching for centuries gave it a scriptural interpretation which completely ignored scientific facts. One can easily understand that at the time the script of the Book of Genesis was written man's world had limited resources for scientific learning. It was very much a world of mythology, superstition about that which ap-

pealed to them as the supernatural among the uninformed and handed down tradition from one generation to another. The beginning of knowledge, in what which we now call western civilization, was in a very small world compared to the world of today.

In the matter of geography the territory occupied by the racial groups whom we hold responsible for the beginning of western civilization was limited to the Egyptian valley of the Nile and the countries which bordered the Mediterranean.

Those who spoke for the record at the time said it was a static world flat in shape with the blue arch of heaven above and an unknown sea of water underneath.

Geography was the first lesson which any race had to learn when it conquered and made some part of the earth's surface a habitat for civilized man. What little knowledge we have of that early beginning of a white man's civilization may be credited very largely to Chaldean, the Egyptian, and perhaps most of all to groups of the semitic race that preceded the later civilizations of Greece and Rome.

It is a matter of record that none of these civilizations failed to make religion in some form of worship an outward expression of the

spiritual nature of man. Owing to the fact, as we have repeated time and time again, that the race as a whole is a race of individuals, this outward expression of a spiritual soul very naturally would be an individual expression and as such would lack the uniformity in religious belief so essential to the organized church. This has been the problem of the church since the beginning of its history and it has tried to meet it by building up a liturgy of ceremonial rites or "articles of faith" most likely to appeal to the spiritual emotions of the worshipper. Some of these, miraculous in concept, had to be accepted on faith alone and without question as to their fallibility.

When this liturgy of the oldest Christian church was under the protection of canon law (and canon law at the time was a powerful instrument in the affairs of government) disloyalty to any part of this liturgy of the church was considered as serious a matter as the crime of high treason to the state and punishable by death.

Religious tyranny at the altar, wearing the garb of the Christian, but under the skin possessing the same lust for power as the political despot on the throne, has been the problem for ages of all civilized states.

When those two powers were combined in a dual interest to rule the state, the illiterate and uninformed man in the street bowed down to it, as he would to a decree from heaven and from which he devoutly believed there was no appeal.

There is no mental slavery so abject in its obedience to authority as that of the individual who puts aside every thought of his own when the question of authority is raised. We have seen disastrous results of this supine attitude on a highly gifted person which, incidentally, would make an interesting study for the psychiatrist.

The car-driver may get the point in our analogy when we refer to the brain cells as the spark plugs of the thinking mind. When a group of them become active on the transmission of a particular line of thought it is not only the psychological but also the physiological fact that for the time being the particular line of thought, whatever it may be, is in complete control of the transmission required for thinking on the subject in mind.

If mind is the greatest thing in created life, cultural training of any sort intended to develop it to its best capacity should preface this training with a word of caution that each

mind is an individual mind and in its untutored state very largely an unknown quantity—even to the psychoanalyst. If the training offered to this untutored mind of the individual hoped to produce the best results, no stumbling block should stand in its way or have its freedom of progress interfered with by any particular school of thought, religious or otherwise, posing as an infallible guide in proper training.

The Americans who drafted a Declaration of Independence and followed this up with a written Constitution, evidently were fully awake to the necessity of free institutions of a cultural nature if the promised freedoms for the individual were to become actualities.

But those words on freedom, finely written and eloquently spoken by the builders of a nation, would have little meaning for the common man until a free public school, a free library and a free press became regular institutions of his every-day community life. A democracy, in the true meaning of the word, is an impossible theory of government when it lacks this kind of a program. It must have its start in the kindergarten of school training where the raw material of human behavior and where the young hopefuls of

the race put their unlimited faith in the guiding hand of the wise teacher.

But the teacher, like the parent, is not always wise. Misfits sometimes are entrusted with positions of the more gifted for the professions, professions which are more responsible than any other for the cultural training of a people that hopes to rise to the level of a highly civilized state.

An illiterate democracy is a contradiction of terms. Where the mass of the common people can neither read nor write the spoken language of the country they inhabit as citizens, their government, of necessity, must assume another name. It cannot be a democracy while in such condition.

However, if not a kingdom or a dictatorship, such a government has been—at least in practice—a theocracy, that is, a government completely under the control and domination of the church.

The anomalous thing noted by the historian about such a government was the prevailing illiteracy and ignorance among the mass of the people which would either seem to have been encouraged by the church or looked upon by the latter as a sleeping giant with

dangerous tendencies in its system for trouble when it woke up.

This brand of government, which had been pursued in Mexico for generations under the dual dictatorship of the church and the state, was bound to come to an end sooner or later by a revolt of the people the moment they found a leader able enough to overthrow it. Politics being what it is and religion being what it is, the human element which rules these two schools of thought has always been a stick of dynamite between them.

President Calles of Mexico, in an address to his people on the state of the nation after he had been in office long enough to gather some facts which would be of some interest to him as chief executive, told them that ninety-five percent of the adult population were disqualified for real citizenship in a democracy and that the majority of them could neither read nor write the language of their country.

President Calles, when he was a young man, completed his academic training at Harvard University. When he returned to his homeland he was in possession of some facts which he picked up about the democracy of his big neighbor north of the border which gave him

an opportunity to throw a spotlight on the question of illiteracy and the lack of a school system which he believed were responsible for this condition of his people.

In the glare and heat of the spotlight the stick of dynamite exploded and we saw things happen in the Mexican Republic which we have seen or at least heard of more than once before.

This was the ambition of the human element in church and state to a rivalry for control of both the secular and religious training of the childhood and youth of the nation.

The statesmen who framed a Constitution for our American democracy were men of British descent whose ancestors were familiar with this kind of rivalry between the church and the state over the question of which should hold the scepter of power in educating the younger generation. The historic record on the matter, handed down to their American descendants by those ancestors no doubt was responsible for the provision in the First Amendment.

This Amendment left the American church standing squarely on its own feet and with absolute freedom allowed its ministry to work out its own salvation and with equal justice

under the law for Protestant, Catholic and Jew.

A public school, purely secular in textbook and teaching, called for different treatment under our government. The responsibility for the system is left almost entirely to the individual States which provide the necessary legislation and financial support. Compulsory attendance of all children of school age is required, with a penalty imposed on a parent who neglects the enforcement of this provision of the law.

Our Canadian neighbors north of our border, reputed to have the best public school system in the world, made the foregoing requirements prime essentials of its English-speaking democracy. The French-speaking province of Quebec put its school system under the control and supervision of the catholic church, the result being the usual percentage of illiteracy among the common people.

This public school system, the starting point for all cultural training reaching out to the homes of all the people in both English-speaking nations, can be credited with the complete understanding and friendliness which have existed from the beginning between these two

American nations. Mexico, our good neighbor to the south of us, with the same intelligent understanding, could be just as close to us.

While illiteracy, however, remains a stumbling block to progress in that Republic, its democracy will be a democracy in name only.

The provision in the First Amendment which advisedly left the question of religion out of the political structure of the nation, didn't prevent any religious organization from preparing the subject of a classroom study in its own private school.

Owing to the controversial character of the subject, or rather the theology built up around it by the church, state authorities found it impossible to allow its teaching in any state supported school.

The Catholic churches of the English-speaking nations—the United States and Canada—solved the question for themselves by providing a system of parochial schools for themselves at their own expense. This naturally brought from the hierarchy of the church the criticism that a public school for the young without religious teaching was a "Godless school," and if this were so the logical inference would follow that it would be a school for the teaching of atheism.

Many centuries ago the ancient Athenian Plato asked the question "What is truth?" Centuries later, a man named Pilate asked the same question. At the time it might have been more to the point had the latter asked, what is religion?

He allowed a Man to be crucified on a cross Who had done His best to define it and Who uttered a prayer before His death, we are told, which was later translated into fifty-one words of Bible text, the sum total of Christian faith. Yet this prayer can be rehearsed again and again by the unlettered and unthinking mind until the spiritual substance of it becomes as innocuous as the mathematics of the multiplication table.

CHAPTER XVIII

NATURALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP

WHEN we speak of the "naturalization" of an alien for citizenship, we mean that we shall extend to this alien, after he has fulfilled certain legal qualifications, the full rights of citizenship. This may have a very significant meaning for the man who really knows America, but sometimes, little or nothing to a man who does not. It is impossible to make this clear to the latter whose interest in America may never have got beyond an economic one. An alien of this type who has acquired citizenship under the liberal meaning we have given the word "naturalization," is really not naturalized. Moreover, he is not likely to be until one or two generations of his tribe have lived and died for some of the things America stands for.

While to this brand of citizen America remains just another place on the map of the world, he will make use of its privileges just as long as the goose will continue to lay the

"golden egg." Under the present status of American civilization we are looking for something akin to the impossible when we look for things to happen over night that are more likely to take ten generations of growth and cultural training to bring them to maturity.

Among these things we may meet up with similar conditions on the continent of Europe.

However, I am convinced that in the great majority of the individuals who make the racial groups we have named, their loyalty to their oath of allegiance and their pledge to the flag would be reassured when it came to a question of unity in a national crisis.

As a nation we must remember that we are still an infant among the racial groups of mankind that make the world's population. It is immature thinking and too evangelistic in its optimism for many of us to believe that we have passed beyond race antipathy in our community life, political experiments in government and a backward-looking religion of fear which still has in its evangelism, too, the race question, which in a practical sense may be unchangeable in its character.

Among the larger groups in our population determined to keep alive the name and tradi-

tions of their former nativity, are the Germans, Italians, Jews and the catholic Irish—the two latter on account of a long traditional religious training.

Had the French group been as large as either the German or the Italian, very likely it would have made one state of the Union its habitat, and as it did in one of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, it would have retained its language as the official language of the state and the Catholic religion, accompanied by the usual high percentage of illiteracy which has prevailed in the past under much of the fire and brimstone of a medieval hell.

But these are the growing pains of all civilized states whose ultimate aim is a more perfect union of its citizens, especially here in America, where a "naturalization" goes far beyond a political oath of allegiance.

That the oath of allegiance of an alien who has applied for the rights and privileges of citizenship may or may not be faithfully observed is a matter which depends entirely on the character of the person to whom those rights and privileges are granted.

There is a vast difference encountered here between different groups which we have al-

ready noted and loyalty to an oath of this character, and is apt to be as varied in truth and integrity as the individuals of the different groups. To one the oath may be merely the essential requirements for the record and a compliance with the law, for deep down in the heart of this individual he is as "naturalized" an American as he would be with ten or twelve generations of American ancestry behind him. This might be especially true if he happens to be of British descent.

Very little change in allegiance to a government is necessary for one who already believes in every principle set forth by that government in its Constitution. For this reason, we gather, the hyphenate is conspicuously absent among Americans of British descent whose mother tongue throughout the centuries has been the English language.

We can extend credit and thanks for contributions in culture to the racial groups which came to America from continental Europe and are now sharing in our American civilization, but those who sit down to write history on this subject must never forget that this civilization we call American was stamped all over with British supremacy before a national government was set up.

This was the naturalization of a people born to govern themselves, but who had received their inspiration to do so from the Mother country, now our ally and fighting for the supremacy of our race. The members of certain races have been quite willing to take the oath of allegiance to the government—live up to all of the requirements of the law expected from good citizens but who are very determined to preserve habits of life which identified them as a group in their former lands. The Jews and the Irish are our best illustrations of this.

To ask a member of either one of these groups to submit to the biologic evolution of "*Naturalization*," against his will, would be about as absurd a gesture as asking the leopard to change its spots. For this reason our American democracy is likely to continue for some time yet a democracy of individual race, and let us hope with at least as much amity and good behavior as such a social relationship would permit.

There are those among us who believe that when any group in our population insists on living to itself and retains its old traditions and inherited habits of life it creates a prob-

lem for the future of our American democracy.

This may be apparent with a race whose members are largely of recent immigration and not more than one or two generations of native birth.

The patriotic associations—especially the American Legion—have been doing a splendid work in bringing the members of such groups to a better understanding of the American way of life—to an awareness that there was something more to the question than a formal oath of allegiance to our government.

The evangelist of religion—quoting the Bible—tells the sinner that he “must be born again,” if he hopes to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

In the “naturalization” of some immigrants who arrived from Europe in the last century it would require more than one rebirth to finish the job and make the reborn citizen look like the product of our American democracy. This will be brought about by the slow process of evolution and the genesis of biology at work in the unseen laboratory of all created life.

But there is nothing miraculous in this. On the contrary, it is quite orderly and profound-

ly scientific. But Mother Nature, in her mystical handicraft, can be just as cruel and disappointing in the business of creation as she is bountiful with her blessings. The change of habitat and the thousand and one things which would effect the creation and character of a human species must be kept in mind when we talk of a homogeneous group of native Americans.

Some groups will submit readily to the influences indicated because there is no conflict in the minds of their members over the principles involved in the "naturalization." Others will string along with perhaps some mental reservation and doubt over the abandonment of their own particular brands of culture which in their native land went back into the centuries of an older civilization.

When this culture happens to be mostly the concern of the individual in character it is considered good American democracy to give it time to fade out of the picture, if it is a misfit. If it is a religious doctrine and not subversive to the government, there is no official conflict of opinion offered on the question and it is left entirely to the individual.

With this kind of a program the Democrat and Republican, the Jew and the Gentile,

the Protestant and the Catholic could sit down at the same conference table without any one of them running the risk of an increase in high blood pressure.

Moreover, this would be democracy in action—it would be the freedom and liberty of America trying to prove to the rest of the world that there can be peace and understanding among people within the boundaries of a nation which is made up of more than a score of different races coming from all parts of the world, and who on arrival possessed every shade of political, religious and economic viewpoints on what, in their opinion, should be woven into the fabric of a social order not only for the land of their adoption but for the peace and understanding of the rest of the world.

CHAPTER XIX

THE FUTURE AMERICAN

THIS concluding chapter is mostly a supplement to the one just written on "naturalization." On account of the many elements that are likely to influence the physical and mental development of the American—let us say a thousand generations hence—we can only picture a type of individual that will be the natural outgrowth of those elements.

It is unnecessary to ask any observing and academically trained person what those elements shall be. We might call the north temperate zone the most favorable part of this western hemisphere as a living place for the best physical development of the race. But it has something more than climate to offer for the best development of a fine race of people. There was at the beginning, and there still exists, the possibility of a food supply in this north temperate zone of America, which easily makes it the garden spot of the world. The potato from the state of Maine, the pork chops from Chicago and the orange of Cali-

fornia would make a fairly good meal for a hungry man. But if this does not satisfy, we could add the refined product for the table from the Iowa corn, the Kansas wheat and the Texas longhorn. Even this does not satisfy the vigorous appetite of the Young American. His teeth waters for a bite into a Washington apple, a Michigan cherry and a Georgia peach.

Such an outlook at the beginning was promising, not only to the land-hungry immigrant who saw in such a prospect nothing less than a bountiful gift of nature put within his reach, but to millions of others with skilled and unskilled hands, ready to turn the raw products of nature into the finished structure of the civilized state.

Such was the job laid out for the coming American on this continent when his ancestors landed on these shores over three centuries ago. The fact that it was a free land open to anyone who desired to own for himself a few acres of it was an element in the original blueprint which was vastly important, not only to that which followed in the makeup of the political structure, but the influence this element had had on the everyday life and behavior of those who possessed this free land.

To speak of the type of individual that biologic science shall refer to in the distant future as the American, it is essential that we keep in mind the elements that make up the fabric of our present population. It may turn out to be nothing more than the vision that a score or more of racial groups will forget their nativity, traditions and exclusiveness and, with only one purpose in view, make their cultural training as universal in character as our English language is at present in every state of the Union.

This would put us well on the way towards that "more perfect union" which was in the minds of that little group of statesmen who sat around a conference table at Philadelphia where a great nation was born. But let us face the facts. Before we reach a condition which resembles anything like this in our national life, every individual now classed as an immigrant from the Old World shall be dust and ashes.

The hyphenates: "German-Americans," "Irish-Americans" and "Italian-Americans," with more or less emphasis on the name by its owner, are all evidence posted by those groups that nativity of birth, former habits

of life and traditions are still very much alive in their minds and hearts.

"So what?" asks the man from Dublin with, let us assume, a noticeable glare in his eyes.

"Just this," replies the native American. "You cannot sing 'My Country tis of Thee' with a divided loyalty in your heart any more than the religious hypocrite can get down on his knees and repeat the Lord's Prayer with the sincerity of a spiritually-minded Christian." Unity of purpose and loyalty to its ideals, on the part of all good citizens, are the tie-beams that rivet the political structure together and prevent it from toppling to the ground in a national crisis—a crisis which may overtake any nation no matter what its strength may be.

However, when we refer to the question of divided loyalty there may be more than one racial group in our population which, for reasons of its own, may never give up its complete identity as a group, even at the price of American citizenship, however valuable this might be.

But this question of "beliefs" and "traditions" of an older civilization, still cherished by some of the groups mentioned as a part of their lives, are not necessarily a cause for

a divided loyalty to our own form of government.

Those beliefs and traditions may be purely personal in character and under our Bill of Rights of no *concern* to us.

They receive notice when a "cherished belief," under the cloak of religion, develops into a full-fledged political theory and is out to "save the country" from its enemies.

There are groups in our population, like the American Negro and the Jew for instance, that had no nationality beyond that which they now enjoy in America. This leaves them out of the question of a divided loyalty.

Then there are groups which came here from such small independent democracies as Greece and Switzerland which, under the circumstances, required little or no "naturalization" beyond the formal oath of political allegiance.

The same formal legal procedure for the rights of citizenship is repeated for the benefit of the English-speaking Canadian-American who crosses the border and makes his choice between the governments of two American democracies.

In such cases it is usually a redundancy of words on the part of the examining attorney to question the viewpoint or knowledge of

the applicant on the principles of government underlying the American Constitution and Declaration of Independence. This was likely a part of his public school education.

Each group first settled on American soil because it hoped for a better outlook on life than that of the land of its nativity. This, at least, is the obvious reason which appears on the surface. If it is true there is an element of hope in it which is as promising for the future of America as the colors of the rainbow seen in a glint of sunshine against the mists that follow the shower.

To put it in another way, the best quality of the human mind was the dynamic element that roused the ambition of the individual in those groups and who looked across the ocean for its field of operations. It was a land with something more than a promise. It was the greatest opportunity ever offered a member of the human race to lay the foundation of a national life which would give those who came to share in its benefits something more than was ever offered before in the previous history of human migration on this earth; a free land coupled with the inalienable right of the individual and common man, to put this right into practice by doing his own

thinking, planning his own way of life and respecting the right of his neighbor to do the same.

This is the order in which it went into the original blueprint of all created life, but we must repeat and keep on repeating, that the civilized state calls for some sort of a socialized order when people draw together for some kind of community life.

America—especially this part of the western hemisphere—when settlement began in the 17th century, offered everything which nature could offer and which was essential for human habitation.

It took the daring genius of an Italian navigator to point it out and convince a skeptical and benighted European world that it could be reached with a sailing vessel in three months by crossing what was then called the Western Ocean.

Some of the European groups referred to in this brief outline on the subject either disregarded the reports of the explorers or were reluctant to risk the hazards of the pioneer in a colonization adventure.

We can easily name outstanding individuals in each of those groups who have contributed something to our American civilization, but

here on this continent, when it came to the question of colonization and laying the foundation of a political structure for a new nation, we may say without hesitation after looking back over the record, that not one of those groups can be placed in the same category with that of the British.

This may explain why we happen to be an English-speaking nation. But it may bring down on the author's head criticism from the members of a dozen or more races now a substantial part of our population. If it does, I place myself in the position of a very wise man of the Bible named Job, who craved that it might be the luck of a certain enemy when he said, "*Would that my adversary had written a book.*"

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



130 154

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY